The Forum

OCTOBER, 1895.

THE PRESENT ASPECT OF THE SILVER QUESTION.

THE present situation of the silver question in the United States is such as should encourage those who are known as "sound-money" men as distinguished from the advocates of the free coinage of silver by this Government at the ratio of sixteen ounces of silver to one of gold. Upon looking over the whole field it is apparent that there are no more advocates of the free-silver policy than there were a year ago; that those who are opposed to that policy are far more outspoken now than then; and that men who seek the favor of the public in many of the regions where free silver has been strong are finding courage to take the other side,—thus indicating in which direction the popular straws, which they see, are beginning to be blown.

A still better sign is the greater intelligence found in those regions where men have been in favor of sound money rather by association and instinct than because they were convinced of its truth through processes of reasoning. Where there was one man able and ready to give reasons for this faith there are now ten. Probably there were few men in New York or in the entire East who did not agree with Senator Sherman in 1890 that the Act of Congress of that year, which bore his name, was safe legislation: the Senator himself went even further and ventured the opinion that it was wise and beneficial. Many men were then to be found in New York who said that they thought it would bring high prices in the stock market,—possibly a veritable "boom." One, if not more, of the sound-money newspapers in New York city was quite strong in the commendation that it bestowed upon that Act,—surprisingly and unaccountably so, as it

Copyright, 1894, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seemed to some persons. Now there is no one who does not see that it was fraught with danger.

The fierce onslaught that the free-coinage interests made in the latter part of 1894 and in the early part of 1895 undoubtedly contributed to the better condition that now prevails, for it stirred men's minds and evolved much original research and thought upon the currency question, and this notably in the regions most affected by the free-coinage sentiment. Even that much-read, specious, and apparently dangerous publication, "Coin's Financial School," has contributed largely to the evident set-back that the doctrines it was intended to advance have received; for it contributed more than many —if not all other—things to the excitement of thought and activity of mind that have resulted in simultaneous publications in reply to it,—publications so numerous as to baffle the industry of the student who attempts to read all of them. Should the Republican National Convention of 1896 adopt such a declaration upon this subject as did the Convention of 1888—a declaration which excited the hopes of the free-coinage advocates, produced the menacing bills of 1890 resulting in the time-serving and cowardly legislation of that year, which was followed by the suffering and ruin from which our people are only now recovering—there is little danger that the party would receive the popular approval it did in 1888.

Of course this improvement in the condition of the public mind has been prompted by rising prices and by returning courage in the business world; investors at home and abroad again have confidence in our securities, which grows as confidence in our money grows. Side by side and step by step the two go on together. Let the latter, however, but halt once more, and the former will turn backward and desert us more completely than before. No one should omit every fit occasion to praise the course the Government took to restore faith last January: it was heroic as a remedy; but our sick country needed a heroic remedy, and the physicians, by the goodness of Providence, were at hand to give it. One gloomy day in January it seemed to be only a matter of hours when there would come an utter breakdown of the already enfeebled business world, with consequences to all classes of our people and to all parts of our country dreadful to contemplate. At the last moment, by the courage of a few men in public office and in private life, this danger was turned aside; and since, by the wise and altogether skilful management of those who made that January contract, and who then took upon them-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves obligations which would have seemed too great to most men, confidence has been restored almost entirely, and our business interests—our whole country—have gained health and strength in a degree so great as to defy measurement. It is easy to exaggerate, however, the comparative influence of better times in changing sentiment: it is more true, as well as more agreeable and complimentary to the intelligence of our American people, to attribute this mainly to investigation, study, and awakened thought.

Rarely has any question been presented to a country more completely and with more ability than has the question of silver been presented to our people. It must be admitted that the free-silver advocates have exhausted every argument and appealed to every interest and passion to induce belief in the justice of their cause. On the other hand, the President, the Secretaries of the Treasury, of the Interior, and of Agriculture, Congressman Patterson and other statesmen, have filled the country with convincing arguments; scholars, statisticians, and publicists have added demonstration and proof; associations of citizens in Chicago, New York, and other places have helped to make a correct knowledge of the laws governing our financial problems accessible to every one. The Chamber of Commerce of New York city, and the Sound Currency Committee of the Reform Club, may be mentioned as among the most active agents in this diffusion of knowledge. A recent report of the Reform Club committee shows that it had distributed millions of documents, and that it had furnished sound-currency arguments every fortnight to weekly newspapers through plate and broadside matter, the aggregate circulation of which was over one million of copies. If truth be in a cause, the intelligence of our people is such that they will grasp it when thus presented. To doubt this is to despair of our Republic.

But over-confidence is unsafe. There are many indications that should warn the advocates of sound money that it will not do to assume that the free-silver cause is dead. We have seen Democratic political conventions in several States to be overwhelmingly under the control of free-silver men. Mr. Hardin and Mr. Blackburn in Kentucky deem it wise to defy the declaration of the Democratic Convention of that State,—an indication that they believe there is a sentiment upon which they can depend in thus disregarding the wishes of the Convention. The danger from all this is not so much that it will accomplish anything ultimately for the free-silver cause, as that it may at some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time appear so formidable as again to alarm the world about the future of our currency, and thus bring upon us again the business troubles from which we are now slowly recovering. Suppose, for instance, that the National Convention of either of the great political parties should declare for unsound money next year: until the result of the election were known, all business would be in constant peril,—the least evil to be expected being utter stagnation for several months. Thus from a business standpoint it is wisdom to keep up the educational effort until the Republican and Democratic National Conventions of 1895 shall have been held.

Almost all the sound-currency effort heretofore has been negative. Since the repeal of the Sherman Act of 1890, which repeal was itself only an Act of negation, little effort has been made, and little thought has been given to any phase of this question save opposition to the proposal to throw open our mints to the coinage of legal-tender silver dollars on a basis which would assume that sixteen ounces of silver were worth exactly one ounce of gold. Those who wish to see our people delivered from the perils which will ever be present so long as we have a currency issued under systems that are in violation of the laws of nature and of sound business principles, should not hold this negative attitude much longer: if they do, currency evils will surely return to our harm; for it cannot be gainsaid that our currency is not based upon sound business principles, and that it does violate the laws of nature. This affirmative work will be full of difficulties, for those who have been united in negation will surely be disunited when it is undertaken; and yet it must be undertaken, and that soon, not only to avert dangers that come from the inherent defects of present systems, but also to forestall proposals for legislation and governmental interference that will be still more pernicious. In my opinion, safety lies in one direction only, and that is to sever Government from currency to the utmost extent possible. All other effort will be but adding danger to danger and worse to bad.

CHARLES S. FAIRCHILD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WELL-MEANT BUT FUTILE ENDOWMENTS: THE REMEDY.

THE entire property of the colleges and universities of the United States is about two hundred millions of dollars, a value equally divided between funds which bear interest, and buildings, grounds, and apparatus. This property is the result either of gift or of an unearned increment. The part that belongs to the unearned increment is small, for American colleges, unlike English charities, have kept only a small share of their possessions in lands and buildings for the purpose of producing income. Two hundred millions of dollars is a very small amount as representing the entire material possessions of the colleges and universities of the United States more than two hundred and fifty years after the settlement of the country. It is a sum not largely in excess of certain private fortunes. It is certainly small in relation to the importance of the higher education to the best interests of American life. This meagreness of material result becomes the more significant when it is known that fully one-fourth of this sum belongs to only four universities. The result is not one to be exulted over; but it is rather one to cause us to turn toward the future with a firm resolve to atone by enlarged benevolence for the poverty or the penuriousness of the past.

Not for one instant can it be doubted that the cause of the higher education represents the best object for the bestowal of general benevolence. Mr. Courtney Stanhope Kenny, in his remarkable book entitled "Endowed Charities" (pp. 238–240), suggests six rules for benevolence:

1. "Of two ways of palliating an evil, we must choose the more powerful."
2. "Relief which removes the causes of the evil is better than that which palliates or increases it."
3. "If we must choose among forms of relief that only assuage the evil without removing its cause, those—if of equal potency—are to be preferred which produce least new evil."
4. "The graver the evil, the more desirable is the charity that relieves it."
5. "An inevitable evil is more deserving of relief than an avoidable one."
6. "An unexpected evil is more deserving of relief than one that could be foreseen."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These rules are wise, but it is to be said at once that they are largely of a negative character; they are rules rather than principles. It would seem that a principle of benevolence, as that principle may be applied to endowment, is that endowments should be given to those philanthropic works the demand for which we wish to increase. Although this principle has certain evident limitations or exceptions, yet its application is broad and generally sound. It applies to the ordinary stable conditions of life. One does not wish the demand for poor-houses to increase, and poor-houses should not be endowed; one does not wish the demand for institutions and agencies for relieving the poor to increase, and no one of these institutions and agencies are worthy objects for endowment. But one does wish the demand for education, higher and lower, and the demand for scientific research, to increase, and these causes are worthy objects of endowment. By endowing poor-houses one makes paupers; by endowing colleges one makes scholars: each endowment creates what it is ordained to create.

It is to be said that the famous arguments of Turgot and of Adam Smith against foundations have rather gained than diminished in force as the arguments are applied to causes other than the higher education. Turgot's argument in the article on "Foundations" in the "Encyclopédie" is still a masterpiece. He states that the intellectual difficulties are so great, and the social problems so complex, which one who wishes to be a founder must meet, that he must be the boldest man who would be willing to run such risks. It is difficult, too, for the philanthropist to diagnose the disease and to distinguish its essential nature beneath superficial appearances. He is in peril of mistaking effect for cause, and cause for effect. Even if he has reached the root of the disease, the difficulty of discovering a remedy is no less great. Many remedies which have been applied have increased the evil; as, for instance, the erection of foundling hospitals, which has tended to augment the evil out of which the need for such hospitals has grown. Furthermore, if a proper remedy be discovered for an evil for a short time, it is very much more difficult to apply this remedy through the long time in which a foundation is supposed to last. The difficulties, therefore, of making a worthy foundation are so great that Turgot believes that it is better not to attempt to lay foundations.

This argument is reinforced by Adam Smith. The great economist asks:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Have these public endowments contributed in general to promote the end of their institutions? Have they contributed to encourage the diligence, and to improve the abilities of the teachers? Have they directed the course of education towards objects more useful, both to the individual and to the public, than those to which it would naturally have gone of its own accord? . . . In every profession the exertion of the greater part of those who exercise it is always in proportion to the necessity they are under of making that exertion. . . . The endowments of schools and colleges have necessarily diminished more or less the necessity of application in the teachers."[1]

But it is to be said that the argument of Turgot is directed toward the limitation of certain evils; it is not directed toward the augmentation of the good. It is evident that his argument does not apply to educational endowments with anything like the force with which it applies to charitable endowments. The pursuit of knowledge, the promotion of research, the offering of opportunities for culture, the establishment of facilities for learning, will represent the worthiest objects so long as humanity has a being at all like its present being. The evils which the great Frenchman alludes to, however alarming in the case of many charities of England, do not appear in the administrations of the two oldest and most illustrious universities of England. These evils, too, have never appeared in any appreciable degree in the life and work of American colleges.

In reference to the argument of Adam Smith, it is to be said, and briefly, that endowment is absolutely necessary to the carrying on of the higher education. The revenue derived from fees is far from being sufficient to support the college or the university. The general evil to which he alludes may attend the establishment of certain foundations, but without the foundations no university could maintain its existence for a year. The universities of England, of the United States, and of Germany, are alike in not being able to support themselves on the fees received from their students.

The proper province of endowment is represented in the spiritual and intellectual interests of man rather than in his physical and material interests. Voluntary benevolence need not concern itself with evils which the state can and will remedy. Those evils which are the most obvious are physical and material evils. Private and voluntary benevolence should therefore concern itself first with the intellectual and spiritual welfare of man. The individual need not attempt to do that which the community as a legal corporate body will

[1] "The Wealth of Nations," Book V, Chap. I, Part III, Article 2d "Of the Expense of the Institutions for the Education of Youth."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do. It is also to be said, and with gratitude, that organized society is constantly enlarging its field of beneficence; it is constantly taking up work and works which were formerly done through single persons. As the man who is by nature a pioneer retires into the forest at each advance of orderly and civilized society, so the pioneer in beneficence surrenders fields which he has formerly worked to the organized beneficence of the community. The kindergarten schools of certain cities have been established and maintained for years by private beneficence. Their usefulness in time became so evident that they have been incorporated into the public-school system. The relief of the poor was formerly a matter for private beneficence; it has now largely come to be a matter of public and legal action. The physical and material evils of humanity are more evident to the ordinary observer than the spiritual and intellectual needs, and these more evident needs are first taken up by the community, and afterward the less apparent ones,—the spiritual and intellectual. And therefore, until the organized community is able to perceive these spiritual and intellectual needs, and to fulfil them, they present the most promising field for voluntary and personal beneficence.

One cannot deny that the history of endowments other than educational is on the whole a rather sad one. Such history hardly belongs to the United States. This nation is altogether too young, and has been too poor, to have made much history of this character. Yet when one turns to the mother-country he finds that the time has been long enough and wealth has been sufficient to allow the making of a history of endowed charities. This history furnishes sufficient justification for keen and profound analysis and diagnosis. For the evils of the community have not been understood. Remedies have not been adjusted to the evils. Sums too large have been donated to remove small evils, and the result has been an increase of evils; sums too small have been donated to remove large evils, and the result has been unremunerative expenditure. Help has too often been given in such a way as to take away the power of self-help. Endowments have been rendered superfluous through change of conditions. The law of proportions has not been observed. Some instances of these propositions are furnished by Mr. Kenny in his book already referred to:

"Admiral B. M. Kelly, in 1867, left £90,000 to found a school for sons of officers in the navy. The lads were to have a first-class education up to the age of eighteen. But the head-master's salary was only to amount to 'the value

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of one hundred bushels of wheat,' which, as the Charity Commissioners said, was 'ludicrously inadequate.' Many further difficulties arose 'from the minuteness with which the testator, who was a sailor, and evidently knew little about schools,' had given directions."

"We have pointed out many important endowments where very large funds are producing at present little or even no result. Thus, Thame Grammar School had two masters and one boy; and those at Sutton Coldfield (endowed with £467 a year), Manceter (£288 a year), and Little Walsingham (£110 a year) were sometimes without any boys at all, whilst the evidence of the Assistant Commissioners included such testimony as the following: 'At Bath an income of £461 appears to hinder rather than promote the education of the citizens, and does nothing for the neighborhood.' 'The fine foundation at Market Bosworth, now £792 a year, is reported to be at present useless.' Gloucestershire and Herefordshire require special notice for the generally unsatisfactory condition of their endowed schools. 'Gloucestershire has seventeen foundations for secondary education, and none of these is reported to be at all efficient.' 'It is difficult to understand that Masham school serves any useful purpose.' 'A school of this kind (Easingwold) does great harm to the community.' 'This school (Bridlington) in its present state hinders rather than promotes the civilization of the place.' 'Much of the vitality of Doncaster school is owing to the fact that it possesses none of the wealth which in so many instances proves to be an encouragement to indolence.'"

"Mr. Cumin tells the story of an old lady who gave away £20 worth of flannel every Christmas. The Christmas after she died the poor people came to the rector and complained, 'If we had known she was going to die, we would have saved our harvest money and bought flannel.'"

"An instance of a very comprehensive and yet very futile foundation is afforded by that of Mr. Henry Smith, who in 1626 left large sums for four objects. Part was to go in redeeming captives from pirates; but since 1723 no captive has been found on whom it could be spent. Part, now producing £8,235 a year, was to go in doles, and is distributed with the usual results among 209 districts, in one of which it is given to one household out of every two, in another to two households out of every three, and in another—according to the vicar—'a charity was never worse applied, its effects are demoralizing.' Part, again, was reserved for Mr. Smith's poor relations, and is still distributed among them to the extent of £6,797 a year, with the result of making it the interest of some hundreds of persons not to work and get on in life. The final part was to be devoted to buying impropriations for preachers, and its income is distributed among the poor clergy, though the resulting benefit is found to be more than counterbalanced by the disappointment caused to the unsuccessful applicants, the trouble of the canvassing, and the perilous habit which it too often inspires of begging with colorable tales of poverty."

These instances, which, though numerous, might be greatly increased, are more than sufficient to prove the downright, sheer, absolute foolishness of many benevolent men. On the whole, men's hearts are better than their heads, their wills than their intellects. Men often choose the highest objects known to them, and with the heartiest enthusiasm adopt schemes of benevolence which seem to them the wisest. But their knowledge is narrow, and their schemes for execut-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing their benevolent intentions are not wise. The number of men and women who every day are devoting their fortunes, time, and labor to benevolence is constantly increasing. One cannot witness these abounding examples of sacrifice without feelings of the deepest gratitude. But one is too often saddened and chagrined on knowing that these benevolences, so generously conceived, are not the product of a comprehensive and reflective wisdom. Too often they represent wasted labor and fruitless self-sacrifice.

Such a condition, however, does not usually belong to endowments given to the higher education; for the cause of the higher education is so comprehensive, and its interests so diverse, that it is only with extreme and most complete foolishness that one can make a mistake in giving to the college or university. For the university is designed to make the best man; and it commands the services of the best men, as teachers of youth, as trustees of funds, and as administrators of serious undertakings. No corporations in the United States are able to command so great talent as the college corporations. One reason of this present condition is found in the exalted purposes which the college is ordained to secure. A further reason lies in the fact that the financial trusts reposed in these administrators are large. The great number of small endowments made in the cause of charity in England has in many cases resulted in waste, because the smallness of these sums could not command men of ability in their management. But the American college holding large sums of money has been able to secure the wisest legal talent and the most worthy moral ability. It is also not to be forgotten that the college stands for certain lasting needs of humanity. One can hardly conceive of changes occurring in the race so great as to render the need of a trained judgment and the usefulness of stores of knowledge superfluous. The changes in the condition of humanity have rendered many trusts absolutely worthless. Such changes cannot, in any degree of probability, occur in those conditions which education represents, as to render funds given to that cause worthless.

Furthermore, the higher education represents conditions which are the least obtrusive. The physical suffering of man appeals to every one; his intellectual wants do not. Those persons, therefore, to whom these wants do appeal as worthy should be especially solicitous to fill them. The college and the university also appeal to the benevolence of the individual through the fact that it is a question

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how far the community should tax itself for the promotion of the higher intellectual welfare. But there is no question that the higher intellectual interests of men are vitally related to all the interests of humanity. It is therefore of supreme importance that these interests be conserved, and they therefore present themselves to one who has the welfare of the race at heart with peculiar persuasiveness. It is, moreover, never to be forgotten that the college represents the most comprehensive interest of humanity. This consideration is well exemplified in the fact that, in the revision of English charities by the Charity Commissioners, the cause of education was judged to be the best cause to receive endowments which had been created for purposes and objects now no longer possible of fulfilment. It was agreed that endowments which had been established for the following purposes: "Doles in money or kind; marriage portions; redemption of prisoners and captives; relief of poor prisoners for debt; loans; apprenticeship fees; advancement in life; or any purposes which have failed altogether or have become insignificant in comparison with the magnitude of the endowment, if originally given to charitable uses in or before the year of our Lord one thousand and eight hundred," [1]—should be applied to the advancement of education.

Truths of this character, recognized throughout the history of this country and especially in the last seventy-five years, have resulted in the donation of large sums of money to American colleges and universities. In England the money that is given to public uses usually goes to the establishment of a charity. There poverty has become a disease; charity deals with it as a disease. In England, too, the interest of wealthy men is largely given to the establishment of a family. One cannot read the wills of Englishmen without seeing that money is usually retained in the family. Such a purpose or principle of founding a family has small value in a new country. One reason of this condition is found in the fact that in the newer country families are not permanent. They are like a wheel,—in constant revolution; the highest part soon becomes the lowest, and the lowest highest. There does not seem to be any strong desire to make them permanent. In England the domestic and the charitable demands for money are so great that Oxford and Cambridge are failing to receive their just proportion. In the United States, institutions are more permanent than families; and of all

[1] Kenny, "Endowed Charities," p. 198.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our institutions those of the higher education—the college, the university—are the most permanent. The colleges and the universities are therefore the objects of special benevolence.

In making an educational or other foundation a founder should bear in mind that his foundation is designed to last forever. He should therefore constantly have in sight the fact that the future is sure to bring fundamental changes, and he should not make the conditions attending his gift so exact that it may at some time become worthless through the impossibility of their fulfilment. It is said that there are more than two thousand endowments for primary education in England which are now rendered absolutely unnecessary through the establishment of schools aided by the government. A founder, therefore, should in general be content with a statement of his comprehensive purpose. He will find it far better to trust the men of the future than to try to perpetuate present methods.

This endeavor to make the standards and methods of the time of a founder the standards and methods of all time receives illustration in our own recent history. The endeavor to give an *exact* interpretation to certain terms in the fundamental instruments of the Theological Seminary at Andover resulted in serious loss to the Seminary; and the endeavor of certain members and friends of the official Board of the Seminary to interpret the ancient document in the light of general principles has seemed to some to result in a failure rightly to appreciate the importance of the specific trust that was committed to the Board. Harvard College, too, in the early part of the eighteenth century, received a gift to found a certain lectureship under certain conditions. By his last will Paul Dudley—

—"gave to Harvard College one hundred pounds sterling, to be applied as he should direct; and by an instrument under his hand and seal he afterwards ordered the yearly interest to be applied to supporting an anniversary sermon or lecture, to be preached at the College, on the following topics. The first lecture was to be for 'the proving, explaining, and proper use and improvement, of the principles of Natural Religion;' the second, 'for the confirmation, illustration, and improvement of the great articles of the Christian religion; the third, 'for the detecting, convicting, and exposing the idolatry, errors, and superstitions of the Romish Church;' the fourth, 'for maintaining, explaining, and proving the validity of the ordination of ministers or pastors of the churches, and of their administration of the sacraments or ordinances of religion, as the same hath been practised in New England from the first beginning of it, and so continued to this day.'" [1]

[1] Josiah Quincy, "History of Harvard University," Vol. II, p. 139.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the college year of 1890–91 the Dudleian lecturer was the Right Rev. Bishop John J. Keene, Rector of the Catholic University of America. His subject, it should be added, was:

"For the confirmation, illustration, and improvement of the great articles of the Christian religion, properly so called, or the revelation which Jesus Christ, the Son of God, was pleased to make, first by Himself and afterwards by His Holy Apostles, to His Church and the world for their salvation."

It is not wise for a founder to say exactly what men shall believe, or in what terms they shall express their belief a hundred years, or two hundred years, or five thousand years, after he is dead. He would better entrust his general purpose, without specific conditions, to the men of the future. Yet it is to be presumed that certain founders will be short-sighted, and that the most generous will lack wisdom. It is therefore fitting that the state should take upon itself the duty of supervising, so far as it is able, all foundations and trusts, and also of reversing all those which fail to fill their purposes. The need is not so great in America as in England; but even in America it would be well for the state to have a Board to watch over foundations. As Mr. Kenny says:

"The periodical investigation of charity affairs by a central authority is requisite to stimulate the activity of the administrators and the economy of their administration. For the former purpose, the state must periodically inquire if the number of administrators is being kept up by new elections to its normal standard, and with what regularity each of them attends the meetings of the body. For the latter, it must periodically inquire into the receipts and expenditures of the charity. The returns of actual revenue must, of course, be checked by comparison with the amount of the revenue-producing capital. Of that amount the state must furnish itself with exact information by requiring the immediate registration of every charitable gift. In old countries, where philanthropy has run a long course before the national life has reached the stage of centralization at which such a register becomes possible, its contents (like the English enrolments under the Act of 1736) will cover only the later foundations. In such a case it must be supplemented by a general inquiry into the present wealth of the earlier ones." [1]

This need of the revision of foundations is clearly expressed by John Stuart Mill in one of his essays. He says:

"At the head of the foundations which existed in the time of Turgot was the Catholic hierarchy, then almost effete; which had become irreconcilably hostile to the progress of the human mind, because that progress was no longer compatible with belief in its tenets; and which, to stand its ground against the advance of incredulity, had been driven to knit itself closely with the temporal despotism, to which it had once been a substantial, and the only existing, im-

[1] Kenny, "Endowed Charities," p. 134.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pediment and control. After this came monastic bodies, constituted ostensibly for the purpose, which derived their value chiefly from superstition, and now not even fulfilling what they professed; bodies of most of which the very existence had become one vast and continued imposture. Next came universities and academical institutions, which had once taught all that was then known; but, having ever since indulged their ease by remaining stationary, found it for their interest that knowledge should do so too,—institutions for education, which kept a century behind the community they affected to educate; who, when Descartes appeared, publicly censured him for differing from Aristotle; and, when Newton appeared, anathematized him for differing from Descartes. There were hospitals which killed more of their unhappy patients than they cured; and charities of which the superintendents, like the licentiate in 'Gil Blas,' got rich by taking care of the affairs of the poor; or which at best made twenty beggars by giving or pretending to give a miserable and dependent pittance to one.

"The foundations, therefore, were among the grossest and most conspicuous of the familiar abuses of the time; and beneath their shade flourished and multiplied large classes of men by interest and habit the protectors of all abuses whatsoever. What wonder that a life spent in practical struggle against abuses should have strongly prepossessed Turgot against foundations in general! Yet the evils existed, not because there were foundations, but because those foundations were perpetuities, and because provision was not made for their continual modification to meet the wants of each successive age." [1]

Every college, like every bank, in the United States, should frequently submit to a Board constituted by legal authority a statement of its financial condition, of the various trusts under which it holds its funds, and of the use which it makes of the income thence derived. Every institution of charity should be constantly ready to give an account of its stewardship. The State should supervise trusts which are made under its authority. The need of this supervision is not at present urgent; for college funds are small, they are at present well managed, and the period of our national existence has not been long enough to introduce many fundamental changes in society. But the need of supervision will become urgent with enlarging collegiate wealth and with the increasing diversity of conditions.

This review brings us to certain rather important conclusions; for the number of people in the United States who desire to make the noblest and most lasting use of their wealth is already large and is constantly increasing. One conclusion is, that it is not the part of wisdom to surround a foundation with very specific conditions. A second conclusion is, that if a gift is surrounded with very specific conditions, a means of relief should be afforded in a general permission to use the gift in the promotion of a general purpose. A third

[1] Mill, "Dissertations and Discussions," Vol. I, p. 52.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conclusion is that a founder should trust the men of the future to carry out his general purpose. He should not lay down certain narrow methods or merely technical rules for their following. The good men of A.D. 3895 will have more wisdom for administering a trust made two thousand years before than any man living in 1895 can suggest to them. The fourth and last conclusion of this review, and one which English and American history confirms, is that the agency through which wealth—be it ten thousand dollars or ten millions—is most certain of doing the most good, to the most people, for the longest time, and in the widest realms, is the college and the university.

CHARLES F. THWING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CRISIS IN ENGLISH HISTORY.

RETROSPECTIVE sagacity is such a common faculty that it has probably occurred to a good many people that the late Government lost an opportunity of a dignified descent from office. When Radicals are in opposition one hears plenty about the iniquity of septennial Parliaments. Democracy, we are told, must be consulted at shorter intervals; hence the place assigned to triennial elections in the Newcastle programme. But no sooner are Radicals in office than a discreet reticence is observed on the subject. *Beati possidentes;* far from any intention of dissolving at the close of their third year, Ministers announced that they would hold on so long as they had a majority of one in the House of Commons. Looking back over the events of this summer, does it not seem that the Cabinet would have secured more respect by carrying into effect that which their party had proclaimed as the right way?—by bringing in their promised resolution about the House of Lords and announcing that Parliament would be dissolved on completing its third year of existence in July. Of course the retrospective sage may be told that this would not be business, but the same may be whispered of a good deal else in the Newcastle programme.

There is no term with which one is more familiar in connection with politics than that of "crisis." In nine cases out of ten the phrase is misapplied. Electors are implored to act as men should do under such a contingency, when nothing is on hand but a phase in the normal process of growth and decay. Even a general election is often no more than a ministerial crisis in the technical parliamentary sense, and people constantly warned that they are passing through a crisis become as indifferent as those accustomed to hear the cry of "Wolf!" when no wolf is near. But there need be no mistake about the general election just passed. It formed a crisis in English history in the full and plain English meaning attached to the Greek word as defined by the dictionaries,—"a decisive point or moment." There were enormous interests at stake. The preservation of a united kingdom; the maintenance of two of the principal pillars of the con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stitution as we have inherited it,—the House of Lords and the national Church; the regulation of a vast branch of trade, involving one of the chief sources of revenue, as well as the security of an immense amount of private capital; the incidence of direct taxation,—all these were to be put in the balance and weighed by the will of the people. And the people have risen to the occasion. They have behaved as men conscious of a crisis; rightly or wrongly, they have registered an emphatic answer.

There was only one element in the situation which modified the intense apprehension of thoughtful men as to the result of the elections, and that was the prevailing presentiment that the Unionists were going to win. But for that, the anxiety of what may without presumption (for Lord Rosebery has given his sanction to the phrase) be called the educated classes would have been painful and without parallel since the Revolution of 1688. All who were acquainted with the historical outlines of the making of England—who were able to trace the agglutinative process whereby, one by one, the independent and hostile septs and principalities occupying the British Isles had become welded into one powerful kingdom with a single legislature—could foresee nothing but national disaster and discredit as the result of the success of a party whose dominant note was Home Rule for Ireland, with Home Rule all around as *obbligato* accompaniment. Those who bore in mind Lord Salisbury's precise definition of the functions of the House of Lords, spoken twenty-seven years ago, must have been perfectly conscious that, if the constituencies returned the Home Rule party in a majority, the Peers could not refuse to pass a new Home Rule bill. Lord Salisbury's words on the occasion referred to were so forcible and clear, and prescribed so accurately the true limits of the functions of an Upper Chamber in a representative Constitution, that they will bear repetition here.

Mr. Gladstone's Suspensory Bill for the Established Church of Ireland had passed the House of Commons by a majority of 54 votes. When it came before the Lords, Lord Salisbury was among those who strenuously opposed it. But he did so on the grounds, not merely of what he regarded as the objectionable policy of the bill, but because the national will had not been clearly pronounced. He said:—

"I am not blind to the peculiar obligations which lie on the members of this House in consequence of the fixed and unalterable constitution of this House. I quite admit—every one must admit—that when the opinion of your countrymen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has declared itself, and you see that their convictions—their firm, deliberate, sustained convictions—are in favor of any course, I do not for a moment deny that it is your duty to yield. It may not be a pleasant process—, it may even make some of you wish that some other arrangement were possible; but it is quite clear that, whereas a Minister or a Government, when asked to do that which is contrary to their convictions, may resign, and a member of the Commons, when asked to support any measure contrary to his convictions, may abandon his seat, no such course is open to your lordships. And therefore, on those rare and great occasions on which the national will has fully declared itself, I do not doubt that your lordships would yield to the opinion of the country; otherwise the machinery of government could not be carried on." [1]

The bill was rejected by the House of Lords by a majority of 95.

Then followed the dissolution of Parliament, and a general election which turned mainly, almost exclusively, on the question of disestablishing and disendowing the Protestant Church of Ireland. The voice of the polls was given decisively, unmistakably, in favor of disestablishment. Early in 1869 Mr. Gladstone brought in a bill to give effect to it,—not merely a Suspensory Bill this time, but a full measure of disestablishment and disendowment. It passed the House of Commons by sweeping majorities,—118 on the second reading. How would the peers deal with it? Mr. John Bright, President of the Board of Trade, took the course—unprecedented on the part of a Cabinet Minister in that more reticent age—of anticipating the decision of the House of Lords by threatening them, in a letter written to the Birmingham Liberal Association, with the consequences of resisting the national will. Most people expected that the Lords would stand firm and throw out a bill to which it was known the great majority of them were hostile. They did no such thing. Lord Salisbury once more reiterated the unimpeachable constitutional doctrine enunciated in his speech of the previous year, and the House of Lords passed the bill by 179 votes to 146.[2]

Who, then, could entertain any doubt, if, last July, a Separatist majority had been returned, that the author of the above-quoted pregnant paragraph was bound to lead the House of Lords to pass a bill conferring Home Rule on Ireland as soon as it should be sent up from the Lower Chamber? It would have been one of "those rare and great occasions on which the national will had fully declared itself."

Behind this spectre of Home Rule stood the shadowy and ominous doom that awaited the House of Lords in the event of a Separatist

[1] Hansard's "Parliamentary Debates," June 26, 1868.
[2] Ibid., June 17, 1869.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

triumph at the polls. The fiery cross had been sent round after the peers' rejection of the Home Rule bill of 1893. It had been brandished, indeed, an ineffectual fire, before the eyes of apathetic audiences; but still it smouldered, and the House of Commons was told to expect a final grand display of pyrotechnics, in the autumn of the present year, to prepare the way for an appeal to the constituencies early in 1896. The prospect of the removal of all effective check on the House of Commons was not one to inspire confidence in the future of their country among those able to read the lesson of its past history.

But besides what may perhaps, without giving unnecessary offence, be called the patriotic party, the propertied classes had cause for the gravest apprehension in the event of the Separatists returning to power. A foretaste of what was in store for them had already been given in Sir William Harcourt's death duties. It is apparent beyond doubt that these, if allowed to remain unmodified, would bring about the irretrievable ruin of the owners of landed property. It had scarcely been concealed that this result was within the calculations of the author of them, and had been emphasized and commended from a thousand platforms. It was dinned into the ears of rural laborers that the squire and the parson were their hereditary oppressors: the death duties were to polish off one of these; disestablishment might be trusted to settle the other. Now, whatever degree of indifference English villagers might feel about Home Rule, however imperfectly they might be able to realize the iniquity of the House of Lords or to discern any benefit to themselves by its abolition or disablement, the squire and the parson were in their midst, tangible examples of a lot easier than their own. There is no handier weapon in the arsenal of the agitator than the envy of the poor toward the well-to-do: nothing easier than to convince the have-nots of the expediency of a rearrangement of incomes. It must be confessed that this weapon had not been allowed to rust from disuse on Separatist platforms and in Separatist journals. Purged of redundant rhetoric, the appeals to the electors remained, at core, neither more nor less than the old revolutionary war-cry,—*Le propriété c'est le vol!* The instinctive affection in the rural breast for familiar institutions had not been proof in 1892 against the gospel of envy; why should the villagers rally more briskly around the Church and the landlords in 1895? In an evil hour for the fortunes of their party, the Gladstonian leaders added another figure to those already

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the pillory. When the publicans appeared in company with the peers, the parsons, and the squires, many who had remained unmoved at the doom impending over these felt that the foundations of society were indeed shaken. The prominence given to the Local Option bill by the leader of the Separatists in the Commons brought home to the understanding of the humblest and most remote community an apprehension of change in familiar environment which, once aroused, is not easily allayed.

Thus it came to pass that alarm was spread, not only among those who, with greater or less clearness of understanding, perceived wherein lay the strength of the United Kingdom and the Empire of which she is the centre; not only among those whose legitimate self-interest was alarmed for the security of property; not only among those whose common sense warned them of the perils of an uncontrolled elective legislature; not only among those who conscientiously upheld the union of Church and State,—but also, and finally, among hard-working men, who discerned in the proposed temperance legislation a meddlesome and tyrannical interference with their liberty and means of moderate enjoyment. In this way the country had been so thickly sown with dragons' teeth that it hardly needed the notoriously treacherous indications of by-elections [1] to warn Ministers of the hostile host which was to spring into existence at the first breath of dissolution.

But there was more than this to nourish the general impression that the Rosebery Cabinet was on the eve of a reverse. There was the knowledge—for it was more than suspicion—that those in the inner ring of the Cabinet were at variance among themselves. Curiously enough, one has only to turn to Lord Rosebery's "Pitt," published in 1891, to read as in a mirror the true cause for the *impasse* to which affairs had been brought. Lord Rosebery is describing how, on the death of Rockingham in 1782, the King set aside Port-

[1] If anything were wanting to confirm the distrust of experienced parliamentarians in regard to by-elections, it has been afforded by the events of this year. Between the general elections of 1892 and 1895, there were thirteen by-elections (besides the Cirencester division of Gloucestershire, which changed sides twice). Nine of these were won by Unionists, of which six were recaptured by the Separatists at the general election, namely, Linlithgow, Brigg, Forfar, Huddersfield, Mid-Norfolk, and Grimsby; and four were taken by the Separatists, of which one, Walsall, has now returned a Unionist. A still more striking instance is given by Invernesshire, which in June last was won from the Separatists by a majority of over 600, but in July gave the Unionist a majority of only 100.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land, whom the Cabinet recommended as First Lord of the Treasury, and appointed Lord Shelburne, upon which Fox at once resigned.

"It was impossible for him . . . to remain; he could not have continued to serve with, much less under, Shelburne. It does not signify which of the two was to blame for this mutual mistrust; that it existed is sufficient. It would be too much to maintain that all the members of a Cabinet should feel an implicit confidence in each other; humanity—least of all political humanity—could not stand so severe a test. *But between a Prime Minister in the House of Lords and the leader of the House of Commons, such a confidence is indispensable.* Responsibility rests so largely with the one, and articulation with the other, that unity of sentiment is the one necessary link that makes a relation, in any case difficult, in any way possible. The voice of Jacob and the hands of Esau may effect a successful imposture, but can hardly constitute a durable administration."

Just so: the voice of Rosebery and the hands of Harcourt were not even a successful imposture. Lord Rosebery's frantic efforts to establish the necessary "unity of sentiment" between himself and his masterful colleague in the Commons were too transparent a trick to escape detection, and it was in the air that the performers were to be hissed off the stage.

When the day of battle dawned, the disunion of the Separatist leaders became more clearly seen. The Prime Minister, faithful to the pledge that the issue should be taken on the maintenance of the House of Lords, declared in Albert Hall, on the eve of the dissolution, that it should be so taken; that that question "was the very tap-root of all political questions." Hardly had the echoes of his voice died away when Sir William Harcourt was heard vociferating at Derby that "he believed from the bottom of his heart that, of all social reforms, Temperance was the most necessary, the most urgent, and the most beneficial." Simultaneously Mr. John Morley was passionately imploring the electors of Newcastle not to believe that there was a word of truth in the story that Home Rule was dead, and assuring them that the Liberal party would be the most deeply disgraced in English history if they failed to keep it in the foremost place of their programme; while Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman declared at Stirling that, so far as Scotland was concerned, by far the most important part of their policy was Disestablishment.

Now it requires no very deep insight into physics to understand that, if two men ride on a horse, one must ride behind. When four leaders of a single party are heard simultaneously proclaiming four separate "tap-roots,"—four different reforms, each of which is declared to be "the most necessary, the most urgent, and the most bene-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ficial,"—it is clear that three of them are destined to disappoint their followers. Sir Charles Dilke has not inaptly described the situation as a disputed succession. It is therefore no matter for surprise that the Separatist forces, bewildered among so many conflicting commands, lost their formation, and what was expected to be a defeat soon became a hopeless rout. The Irish wing were in even worse plight. No one had time to weep with Mr. William O'Brien over his bankruptcy, as strong men had once wept with him over his breeches. The fierceness of faction had shattered the party whose leader had once boasted, not without something to show for it, that he held the Imperial Parliament in the hollow of his hand. Mr. M'Carthy was busy rebuking Mr. William Redmond; Mr. William Redmond was retorting on Mr. M'Carthy; and Mr. Healy was reviling both. The prospect of Home Rule was not, at the moment, a very attractive frontispiece for the Separatist programme. In Scotland, the shade of that reproachful exile, Dr. Macgregor, threw a gloom across the scene once illumined by the constellation of Midlothian. The public made up their minds that there would be a Unionist majority, and the only question which seriously exercised them was what the size of it would be.

Now there are not wanting many thoughtful persons who strongly hold the opinion that it would be better for all parties concerned, and the public in general, that all elections should be held on the same day, as in the United States. The arguments in favor of this are certainly worthy of the consideration they have received; the most important, perhaps, being that the general business of the country would not suffer the same degree of interruption as under the present system. There is not as much weight in this as may appear on a casual view. It matters not whether the elections be held on a single day, or be spread over three weeks: the necessary preparation for them will absorb the attention of the public equally in either case and for as long a period. More plausible is the view that simultaneous election of all members would produce a truer reflection of the opinion of the constituencies. The tendency of successive elections to follow the impetus set in motion by notable triumphs on one side or the other is too well marked to be disregarded. It is not necessary to accept the explanation of the Unionist triumph in London, given by Mr. John Burns to his constituents, as being due to the fact that "25,000 wobbling voters, more or less drunk, had voted with beer," in order to recognize the existence of a percentage of "wob-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blers" who throw in their lot with the winning side. These prevail to decide many an election, and no doubt they contributed something to the result in the contest just brought to a close. There had been notable Unionist gains before Sir William Harcourt and Sir Thomas Roe were defeated at Derby, and it would be difficult to calculate how many subsequent gains were ensured by that memorable reverse. But this much is known, that the most sanguine estimate formed by instructed Unionists of the coming majority did not amount to three figures. Captain Middleton, the able and experienced head agent of the Conservative party, spoke with confidence of a "spanking majority" of about 80, but there were plenty of others who would gladly have compounded for 50. Admitting, therefore, that one-third of the majority of 152 may possibly be traced to the influence of early Unionist successes, including those at Derby, Newcastle, and London, it remains far from certain that this factor, however detrimental to the prospects of the losing party at the time, is adverse to the national interest. Few evils are more to be dreaded, under our parliamentary system, than government by a narrow majority, whether of Conservatives or of Liberals. This evil was accentuated under the late Administration by the fact that Ministers relied for their existence on the support of a third party—the Irish Nationalists—for whose support they had paid an extravagant price in principle and prestige. The grand sacrifice of principle was made in 1886, when they adopted a Home-Rule policy; the latest loss of prestige was incurred when, last June, their Irish allies forbade them at their peril to take a vote of £500 for a statue of Oliver Cromwell. No Administration can afford to "climb down." The strong Conservative Government of 1886–92 never recovered the ground lost by the withdrawal of the Licensing and Compensation clauses in their Local Government measure. This, too, came on the back of the double humiliation of Sir William Harcourt, who, deferring perforce to the Irish veto, had first excluded Ireland from "the most necessary, the most urgent, the most beneficial" of social reforms, and limited his temperance legislation to England and Scotland, and next, in his Budget resolutions, left the burden on British beer unlightened and took sixpence off Irish whiskey.

It was this cringing to the tyranny of Parliamentary groups, this sacrifice of Imperial to party interests, this clinging to office without wielding the power of office, that sent the Separatist party before the electors foredoomed not only to defeat, but to disgrace. Now, inas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much as a narrow majority of one party over the other is much more likely to be the result of elections held simultaneously in every constituency, whereby the party returned to office must be exposed to the risk of finding itself without power, it seems to follow that the influence of earlier elections upon succeeding ones is practically an advantage to the commonwealth, however irrational it may appear in theory. Give us, above all things, a strong Government independent of faction. Whether Ministers call themselves Whig or Tory, Separatist or Unionist, is a matter of subsidiary moment. "Give us," cried Mr. Gladstone from the depths of his heart, in 1885, "such a majority as will make us independent of Irish votes!" He foresaw too clearly the temptation that would present itself if that were refused. It was refused, and the temptation proved too strong for him.

Before turning to consider the position now occupied relatively by the Government and the Opposition in the House of Commons, note may be taken of some of the most striking incidents of the struggle of which it is the result. The first thing that impresses one as remarkable is that the Unionist gains have not been achieved in one part of Great Britain as distinguished from another, but are generally distributed over the whole electoral area. In Ireland, of course, the Unionist cause has gained no ground,—has lost it, indeed, to the extent of two seats; but to what a plight must those who claim exclusive right to the title of "Liberal" be reduced before they can seek consolation in that. They know that the Nationalist party threw their weight into the Gladstonian Liberal scale because it was from that quarter alone that they expected to wring the minimum of their demands. That expectation must be at a low ebb now; it remains matter for speculation what future relations may be developed between these incongruous allies. Meanwhile, to use a homely expression, the Separatist can hardly expect either praise or pudding from the connection. That which will probably prove the last Parliament elected in the nineteenth century[1] has been returned to ratify the legislative union with Ireland which was established by the last Parliament of the eighteenth century. Home Rule will be in the background for several sessions to come, and it is notorious that the support

[1] People are slow to give up the belief that the demise of the monarch causes an immediate dissolution. That used to be the law, but it was altered by the Reform Act of 1867. In the event (which the whole nation trusts may not occur) of Queen Victoria dying within the statutory lifetime of the present Parliament, there would be no constitutional necessity for a dissolution.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given by Irish Nationalists to the other parts of the Newcastle programme was unmitigated log-rolling. That, at least, has received its quietus for some years to come. In England, the "predominant partner" speaks with no uncertain voice. Of the counties, seventeen have returned 74 Unionists to 17 Separatists, and five others have sent up 23 Unionists to 5 Separatists. In Lancashire, the miners' vote—the only strand in the Gladstonian rope which stood the strain in all other parts of the kingdom, except Stirlingshire—was not strong enough to pull through more than 4 Separatists against 22 Unionists. No doubt this result was contributed to by indignation against the policy which sanctioned the levy by the Indian Government of a duty upon British cotton; indeed few can have taken an active part in the elections of any part of the country without being made conscious of the growing dissatisfaction with our accepted system of free imports and heavily taxed exports.[1]

Comparing the votes in Metropolitan constituencies in 1895 with those in 1892, it is found that there was an increased Unionist vote in all but two of the sixty-three divisions, amounting in the aggregate to a gain of 21,437 votes. From this must be deducted an increase of 72 in the Separatist vote in Central Hackney, and of 152 in East St. Pancras, both of which seats, however, returned a Unionist, leaving a net increase of 21,213 votes on a total electorate of 609,320.[2] This is balanced by a decrease in the aggregate Separatist vote of 23,862.

The record of London since 1885 stands as follows:

1885		1886		1892		1895	
Conservative..	37	Unionist....	51	Unionist....	37	Unionist....	54
Liberal.....	25	Separatist ..	11	Separatist...	25	Separatist...	8

To realize the full significance of these figures, the mind must be carried back to the general election of 1868, when the solid phalanx of London Liberalism was first broken by the Conservatives win-

[1] Perhaps candidates for London constituencies can tell their experience in this respect. Some have done so already, and what London thinks to-day England is very likely to insist on to-morrow. The ordinary elector, though he may comprehend rude diagrams of the big loaf and the little one, has no time to examine the truth of Mongredien's dogma that imports are paid for by exports. He is apt to ask whether Pharaoh received payment for his corn in the shape of Israelite manufactures.

[2] This total includes the voters in uncontested seats, in which, of course, there was no opportunity of testing the Unionist gain or loss. In these cases the figures of the last contested elections have been used.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ning one seat out of four in the City, and one out of two in Westminster.

The result in the great provincial towns is hardly less remarkable. Of these, the twenty-eight largest, with a total population of 4,672,104, have returned 60 Unionists and 22 Separatists. The borough representation of the United Kingdom since 1885 has been thus:

1885	1886	1892	1895
Conservative.. 86	Unionist....131	Unionist....111	Unionist ...146
Liberal 136	Separatist... 91	Separatist...111	Separatist... 76

There were two regions in Great Britain where, if anywhere, the Separatists might have reasonably expected to hold their own, namely, in Scotland and in Wales. The solidarity imparted to the Gladstonian ranks in the North by their great eponymos, the member for Midlothian, could hardly, it was thought, have been dissolved during the short interval since his retirement from active politics, especially in view of the succession to the Premiership having devolved on a deservedly popular Scottish peer. For the first ten days of the elections it looked as if the Gladstonians were at least to hold their own in Scotland, so much so that Mr. Gladstone was tempted into an effusion of grateful recognition. Hitherto the old Parliamentary hand had been resolutely still; the veteran had coyly refused to be more than an onlooker. But when he witnessed his hard-pressed Caledonian legions yielding no ground, he could not refrain from a chivalrous note of sympathy, and he wrote to acknowledge that here, at least, were faithful found. Alas, it was premature! The letter was hardly sealed before three Scottish counties, Argyleshire, Stirlingshire, and Elgin, went over to the victorious party. So far from being less successful in Scotland than in England, the Unionist cause, as compared with the Conservative as it stood after the election of 1885 (the first on the extended franchise) shows a greater advance in North Britain than elsewhere. For whereas there were in 1885 only 10 Conservatives returned for 72 seats, there are now 33 Unionists,—a gain of 32 per cent; whereas in England the gain can be reckoned at only 28 per cent. Moreover, just as the policy of prohibition had been overthrown at Derby in the person of Sir William Harcourt, and Home Rule had got its *coup de grâce* at Newcastle in that of Mr. John Morley, so in Glasgow Sir Charles Cameron went down, the protagonist of Scottish Disestablishment. Sir John Stirling Maxwell, a young and inexperienced politician, succeeded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in turning a minority of nearly 1,200 into a majority of equal magnitude, thus ousting a member of five-and-twenty years' continuous experience. Here is "dear old Scotland's" position:

1885		1886		1892		1895	
Conservative..	10	Unionist....	29	Unionist....	22	Unionist....	33
Liberal.....	62	Separatist...	43	Separatist...	50	Separatist...	39

The turnover in Scotland was brought about by an increase of 9,450 in the Unionist vote, and a decrease of 12,138 in the Separatists.

Wales, which was supposed to be writhing for the disestablishment of an alien Church, gave no more genial response to her self-constituted champions. Represented in the last Parliament by 28 Separatists to 2 Unionists, the figures now stand 22 Separatists to 8 Unionists. Mr. Chamberlain, to whose vigorous exertions and well-defined personality may be attributed far more than the mere Unionist supremacy in the Midlands, has claimed for North Worcestershire the distinction of having passed more emphatic censure on the late Government than any other constituency in the United Kingdom. A Separatist majority of 2,158 in 1892 was there turned into a Unionist majority of 988 in 1895, a difference of 3,146 votes, representing a turnover of 1,573 electors. *Palmam qui meruit*—the meed must be bestowed elsewhere; it has been won in Wales itself. In Merthyr Tydvil the Separatist majority of 9,644 in 1892 has melted away to 2,725 in 1895, a difference of 6,919 votes, representing the turnover of 3,459 electors. One remarkable feature of the Welsh elections is this, that whereas the aggregate Separatist vote has remained nearly stationary, showing a decrease of only 247 on the figures of 1892, the Unionist poll has grown by 9,450 votes.

The defeated party are bravely busy in trying to extract some consolation from political arithmetic. It has been said that the number of seats won by the Unionists is out of proportion to the total number of votes polled. There never was a general election yet when the losers have not applied this balm to their wounded feelings. It is a floating balance that usually turns elections: call them "wobblers" if they are against you,—"converts" if they are on your own side. But not since 1832 has there been an election where the "wobblers" had less influence on the result than they had last July. That the movement was one of masses, not of molecules, was well brought out in the analysis of the elections published in the "Times"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of July 31, where the aggregate votes on either side in Great Britain, exclusive of Ireland, were shown as compared with the figures of 1892.

	Unionist Votes	Unionist Members	Separatist Votes	Separatist Members
1892 ...	2,139,502	292	2,105,589	275
1895 ...	2,267,555	390	2,012,583	177
	128,053 increase		93,006 decrease	

—"a difference of 221,059 votes, equivalent to the conversion of 110,529 Separatist into Unionist voters, or about 5¼ per cent on the Separatist poll: that is to say, out of every 19 who voted Separatist in 1892 one has been converted into a Unionist."

There can be no doubt that some part of the change was brought about by the vague fear stirred in the minds of quiet, well-to-do people by the Anarchist and Socialist movements. Life is too short, and for most people too busy, to admit of analysis and understanding of all the so-called advanced platforms. Anarchism and socialism are in theory opposed to one another, for the Anarchist wants to sweep away all authority, while the Socialist aims at government interference at every point where the citizen enjoys liberty under present conditions. But in confounding the two schemes and using "Anarchist" and "Socialist" as synonymous terms, the popular judgment is not far wrong in the conclusion to which it comes, for anarchism and socialism both aim at the destruction of that scheme of government under which this country—and every other country that has become great—has attained to security, prosperity, and internal tranquillity. Nothing has been more conspicuous in the general election than the insignificance of the Anarchist, Socialist, and Independent Labor vote. By a happy coincidence the Social-Democratic Federation held their annual conference at Birmingham immediately after the close of the polls. This organization—which, to quote the words of one of its officials (even the Social-Democratic Federation is conventional enough to have its president, deputy-presidents, and staff), is not national, but international—has been in existence in England for fifteen years. The president informed the conference that 5,000 propagandist meetings had been held during the last year. Inasmuch as the Federation was able to run only four unsuccessful candidates at the elections, who polled an aggregate of between 2,000 and 3,000 votes, it does not seem that their doctrines have taken deep root on British soil. Their kinship to anarchism may be traced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the first business discussed on the second day of the conference, namely, the circulation of leaflets entitled "A Few Facts about John Burns." These facts, it may be assumed, were not complimentary to the only avowed Socialist returned to the new Parliament. But Mr. Burns seems quite ready for civil war in the Socialist ranks, for on Sunday, August 4, he regaled his constituents with his view of the causes for the capture of London by the Unionists. This, he said, was partly owing to the fact that "25,000 wobbling voters, more or less drunk, had voted with beer," and partly to "lies served up from the Social-Democratic well." We may leave Mr. Burns to justify his compliments to the democracy of London, and to settle accounts with his Social-Democratic critics, with the comfortable assurance that the social revolution, for which the conference cheered in separating, is not quite so imminent as it might be if its well-wishers could agree among themselves. But it may be observed in passing that Mr. Burns, in attributing the result of the elections to the influence of "beer, Bible, bribery, and blackguardism," was only uttering a coarse paraphrase of the explanation proceeding from other sources. The majority of 28 in the House of Commons last June was the mandate of the democracy to recast the constitution; the majority of 152 is the voice of the publican, the parson, and the Primrose dame. This, of course, is not the real opinion of the responsible leaders of the defeated party. They know what it all means, that they must bide their time and recast their policy. Their knowledge is shared by the more thoughtful of the rank and file. "Unfortunately," confessed the chairman of Mr. Causton's meeting in West Southwark on July 29, "the Liberal party has undertaken too much, and has succeeded in irritating every class by attempting legislation for which people are not quite ready."

But besides what the Separatist party has done, they have had to bear the odium of that for which they are only indirectly responsible. The Cabinet of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Rosebery cannot be justly accused of having actively encouraged the aims of anarchism and socialism. But when an Administration is at its wits' end to scrape together a majority, it draws to itself all the extreme groups on the lookout for Ministers to do their work. The Separatists had accepted Home Rule as the price of the Irish support; were the electors to blame if they believed them capable of paying a similar price for the Socialist vote? It is the vaunt of the Socialists to be reckoned as the Extreme Left, and the distaste of our people for socialism could be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expressed only in those constituencies where no Socialist candidates were run, by voting against candidates of the Left.

One value of a general election is found in that it is a kind of stock-taking, and it is a reassuring outcome of this one that Socialist and Anarchist propaganda, which have spread so widely among our German cousins and French neighbors, have been shown to have made little headway among our own people. There are Socialists among us, just as there are neo-Buddhists; there are Anarchists as there are pious Jacobites; but, thus far, they are a negligible quantity. Busy and comfortable people regard them as the same thing; an ugly bogy, indeed, but still a long way off.

It is probable that the direct influence of the trade unions upon the elections fell far short of what was expected. In all the strikes brought about by these organizations there has always been a considerable minority of members, anxious to continue at work, and only yielding to pressure in desisting. These men have felt themselves the victims of tyranny,—and tyranny of the many is as deeply resented as tyranny of the few. Therefore, though the officials of trade unions are generally Radical, and instruct members to vote that way, it is not possible to enforce obedience. Thus it came to pass that at Derby and Crewe, the headquarters respectively of the Midland and London & North Western railway men, the Unionists achieved signal victories. This is all the more remarkable because the chief act of the Separatist Government affecting the industrial classes was a measure promoted by the officials of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Workers, restricting the hours of labor. It may be supposed that the boon was not appreciated by those whom it was intended to conciliate, who were thereby deprived of earning overtime pay.

One other feature in the conduct of the late Administration contributed appreciably to its downfall. Their sincerity was, rightly or wrongly, the subject of suspicion. There were ugly stories afloat about the honors conferred on Lord Rosebery's recommendation, but it was not necessary to go so far as to believe that peerages and baronetcies were cynically exchanged for contributions to the election chest. It was quite enough to throw a doubt on the *bona fides* of the projected attack on the Lords to see the leaders who were to direct it distributing peerages among their followers. If hereditary lawgiving was the iniquity it was described, was there not guilt in creating more hereditary lawgivers? From one end of the country to the other this puzzled some and disgusted others.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is some obscurity hanging over the future of a subject which, trivial as it may seem, has never yet been without its importance in Parliamentary warfare in Britain,—namely, the future nomenclature of the principal political parties. For the present, the terms "Unionist" and "Separatist" are convenient enough, but it is obvious that they are only serviceable *pro hac vice*. It is not likely that the Opposition, in preparing for the next appeal to the country, will be so blind as to put Home Rule in the front, or, indeed, in any part of their programme. If, then, the maintenance of the Union be not at stake at the next general election, wherein will the titles "Unionist" and "Separatist" be appropriate? "Nationalist"—a term which best expresses the patriotic confederation supporting the present Government—has been appropriated as the common designation of Parnellites and Anti-Parnellites. "Conservative" will not serve, because the Liberal-Unionists, who were threatened with annihilation, have returned 77 strong instead of 42, and their importance can hardly be overrated. "Constitutional" has far too many syllables, —in short, the name has not yet been minted which shall serve to distinguish the Unionist Party of the twentieth century.

Howbeit, we may rest content with the substance, and leave its future designation to be the spontaneous outcome of events. The empire has been delivered from the nightmare of the last ten years. Future historians shall describe how the nations of the world looked on, shrugging their shoulders, while England, alternately their model and their warning, was engaged during that space of time in the controversy whether she should loosen the girdle that held her robes of power together, and how her people finally declared that it should not be.

HERBERT MAXWELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAUSES OF THE LIBERAL DEFEAT.

THAT the "uses of adversity" are "sweet" is a dictum from which one is sometimes tempted to dissent. That they are salutary is beyond question; and no one will grudge a defeated party or an unsuccessful candidate the austere edification which can be drawn from a critical study of recent misfortune. Such a study I am invited to undertake in THE FORUM, and I willingly comply with the invitation.

I must begin my task by admitting the full severity of the blow which we have sustained. I have no sympathy with knock-kneed attempts to show that an overwhelming defeat, lightly regarded, is a moral victory. I have no interest in complicated statistics which only prove that, if every one had voted differently, different results would have ensued. My task is limited to answering the Editor's question, What causes, in my judgment, contributed most to our defeat? In estimating those causes I do not presume to speak for my colleagues in the late Government, for the Liberal party as a whole, or even for that Radical section of it with which I am especially associated. I rely on my experience in my own constituency, enlarged by what I have seen and heard in those many districts of the country which I have visited for electioneering or speech-making purposes during the last three years.

At the general election of 1892 I was returned for the Northern Division of Bedfordshire. Out of an electorate of 13,686, I polled 5,600 votes: my opponent 5,056. At the general election of 1895, out of an electorate of 13,744, I polled 5,376: my opponent 5,643. So far, therefore, as the figures go, it would seem that 5,000 electors stood firm on either side; that 224 went over from me to my opponent; and that my opponent procured 363 new supporters, who had not been on the register—or, at any rate, had not voted—at the former election. If this be so, it represents, of course, no very sweeping change of opinion—no very considerable turnover of votes; but it fairly represents the amount of change which, occurring all over the country, has given to Lord Salisbury his huge majority. In some cases, of course, the change was emphatic, and the turnover

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enormous. Those cases, however, would not have produced the present result, if they had not been supplemented by the many where, as in my own, a small majority for the Liberals in 1892 was transformed into a still smaller majority for the Tories in 1895.

If any constituency was thus fairly typical in respect of the amount of change which it manifested, it was not less so in its character and history. North Bedfordshire is almost entirely rural. It contains no large town (for the borough of Bedford, though in the Northern Division geographically, is outside politically, having a member of its own): it has no considerable factories, no collieries, no mines. It contains three small towns, with the usual proportion of gentlefolks, tradespeople, and artisans. There are three or four great landowners, a large number of farmers, a sprinkling of professional men; of course in every parish an Established clergyman, and in most a Dissenting minister. But after all these deductions it remains true that the great bulk of the voters are agricultural laborers, and live by daily work on the land at an average wage of twelve shillings a week. In brief, North Bedfordshire is a fair sample of the rural constituencies of England. Its electoral history is that in 1885—the first year in which the agricultural laborers had the vote—it gave a Liberal majority of 1,615; in 1886 it gave a Unionist majority of 482; in 1892 it returned me, a Gladstonian Radical, by 540; and in 1895 it rejected me by 267.

Such being the nature of the constituency with which I had to deal, and the result a defeat for Liberalism, I proceed to answer the question as to the causes which chiefly operated against us. I take those which have seemed to me most potent; and I take them not according to their respective importance, but rather in the chronological order in which, one by one, they became apparent to me.

1. I put first what is described, in a variety of metaphors, as "the wave," "the turn of the tide," and "the swing of the pendulum,"—in other words, the tendency of democratic constituencies to change from side to side at successive elections. This tendency has been manifest in England ever since we have had a wide suffrage protected by the ballot. In the old days of open voting, the shame of tergiversation helped to keep the ordinary voter straight. But now that, under the ballot, each voter is, as Junius said, "the depository of his own secret," he votes whichever way his settled conviction or his passing fancy may suggest. "These men have been in long enough. Let's give the other side a turn,"—is an electoral for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mula often heard, and still oftener acted on. The suffrage was first given to the artisans in towns in 1867; to the agricultural laborers in the country in 1884. The ballot was established in 1872. The general election of 1868 gave a majority to the Liberals; that of 1874, a majority to the Tories; that of 1880, a great majority to the Liberals. The election of 1885 made the Liberals equal to the Tories and the Irish combined. This equality was disturbed by the introduction of Home Rule under Mr. Gladstone, who was heavily beaten in the election of 1886, and restored to power, with a small majority of Liberals and Irish combined, in 1892. This year the Liberals have been defeated more heavily than ever in their previous history. In view of these electoral permutations, it is surely impossible to doubt the importance of "the wave" as a factor in all political calculations; and it was to "the wave" and its probable effect that I first turned my thoughts when, on the close of the election of 1892, we began to forecast the future. It has proved to be of Atlantic size and force, and some of the voyagers whom it has submerged ruefully remark that, in anticipation, they scarcely did justice to its powers.

2. It is difficult to overestimate the effect of the retirement of Mr. Gladstone. It is true that, in the elections of 1874 and 1886, Mr. Gladstone's leadership did not save his party from defeat; but it is to be borne in mind that in both those cases his recent policy had alienated great masses of his supporters, who deliberately abstained from the polls because they disapproved of his dealings, in the one case, with public education, and in the other, with Home Rule. Against a deliberate resolve of that kind, even Mr. Gladstone's personality could not prevail. But his supreme value as an electioneering force lay in this: that in those who followed him he inspired a personal devotion which was akin to religious fanaticism. His moral enthusiasm infected his disciples, and, led by him, they went into an election as into a crusade, and fought as only men can fight who are consumed by self-sacrificing fervor for a sacred cause. In a contest such as that through which we have just passed, this personal enthusiasm would have been of incalculable value. Our action had not, as in 1874 and 1886, given distinct offence to our own people; there was no determination among our former supporters to vote against us or to abstain. But there was a certain amount of indifference, listlessness, and languor, and against evils of that kind Mr. Gladstone was omnipotent. Himself inspired, he inspired his followers, and each follower transmitted the sacred

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spark of enthusiasm to two or three languid or careless souls who might otherwise, through sheer indifference to political issues, have come over to the party of reaction.

> "We that had loved him so, followed him, honored him,
> Lived in his mild and magnificent eye,
> Learned his great language, caught his clear accents,
> Made him our Master to live and to die."

We knew the immensity of our loss when, on that dismal 1st of March, 1894, we realized that we had heard him for the last time in the House of Commons.

3. Next I must put bad times. I have neither the skill nor the space to discuss the causes and cure of commercial depression. The rural electors do not concern themselves with the theory, but they are keenly alive to the fact. Indeed it would be difficult to ignore an evil which makes itself felt pretty impartially by squires, farmers, clergymen, artisans, and laborers. Times are bad: there is little money about, not much work, and a chance of less. By some process of reasoning not easy to follow, these evils are traced to the Liberal Government, and those who ought to know better trade on the credulity and the sufferings of the least-instructed class by suggesting that, if the Tories get back into power, there will be an increase in work and wages. "Vote for Compton and better times" was my opponent's placard: and in vain I replied that "Vote for Russell and more rain" would be quite as reasonable a cry. But the sufferers from bad times were not only led to expect benefit from a change of Government; they were also menaced with even greater distress if the Liberal candidate were returned. "If you vote for the Liberal, there will be no work this winter," was an ambiguous but intelligible warning freely used; and the careful avoidance of any direct or personal threat made it impossible to proceed legally against the author of the suggestion. When we think how very little an agricultural laborer earns; what it means to him and to his family to lose a week's work or a shilling of wages; and when we further remember that he is a tenant-at-will in his cottage, and can be evicted without appeal by an offended landlord,—the wonder is, not that a handful of voters yielded to pressure, but that the great bulk stand as firm as rocks in their simple loyalty to honest conviction.

4. I am not disposed to lay much stress on territorial influence. In my own case I believe that every squire except one—a notable exception certainly—was against me; and two peers of enormous wealth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were understood to be straining every nerve for my defeat. Yet we did not find that in the villages more immediately under these great men's domination we suffered any special loss, nor did we ever hear of a single voter who voted against us because the Duke of B. or Lord C. wished it. The influence was rather felt in an indirect fashion. The tenant-farmers were emboldened by their landlords' known wishes to put extra pressure on their laborers; and the very long purses on which my opponent was able to draw gave him unlimited funds for the expensive work of organization. It must be remarked in this connection that an English electoral law, while rigidly proportioning what a candidate himself may spend to the number of electors, in no way limits the amount of extraneous aid which friendly individuals or associations may send to his assistance. Under cover of this palpable anomaly there has recently sprung up a custom of importing into each constituency, at election-time, a host of mysterious strangers who profess to come from Ulster, and, spending money freely in the public-houses, and visiting from door to door, propagate blood-curdling stories of the religious persecution which Home Rule would entail. It can scarcely be doubted that these stories, preposterous as they are, produce some effect on earnest but timid Nonconformists.

5. This leads me, from general considerations, to a special question of pure politics. How did Home Rule affect the election of 1895? In 1886 Home Rule was a new policy. Great numbers of good Liberals were frightened and perplexed by it, and, as I said above, deliberately abstained from voting,—some even voted against us; and the result was a great Liberal defeat. But during the six years which elapsed between 1886 and the next election, a great change took place. I cannot say that, in my opinion, Home Rule ever excited great enthusiasm in England; but the Liberal electors were gradually led by Mr. Gladstone's impassioned advocacy, and by the more humdrum argumentation of his supporters, to recognize the reasonableness of the Irish claim to self-government, and its essential consonance with the fundamental idea of Liberalism. Fears of religious persecution, of separation between Ireland and England, and of danger to life and property under a system of Home Rule, gradually faded away from most of the minds which had harbored them. No doubt a certain percentage of Liberal voters had gone over to the Tory or "Unionist" camp, and remained there; but the great bulk of those who had been frightened away by Home Rule in 1886 had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

returned to their Liberal allegiance by 1892. For my own part I saw no marked alteration in this respect between 1892 and 1895. The Liberal electors seemed to have made up their minds that the Irish claim to self-government was just and sound, and to have finally accepted the theory of Home Rule. I could not, however, fail to observe that two or three considerations tended to modify their zeal for the Irish policy, which still, as a matter of abstract reason, they accepted. In the first place, the shape in which our Home Rule bill left the House of Commons, retaining the Irish members in the Imperial Parliament for all purposes, English as well as Imperial, was not acceptable. Personally, I have always been a strong advocate for the retention of the Irish members, as the symbol and safeguard of Imperial Unity, and to that view I adhere. But it is obvious that, if they are to be retained, any plan which enables them to vote on purely English, as distinct from Imperial, questions, can be only a temporary arrangement, pending a complete system of all-round devolution under a central Parliament. The nature of this makeshift, and the necessity for it, were difficult to explain; and our opponents made great capital out of a plan which seemed to put England under the power of the Irish members, while they, in their local Legislature, would be exempt from our interference.

In the second place, I found that we had made a mistake in refusing to apply the word "subordinate" to the Irish legislature which we proposed to create. We had won the election of 1892 by reiterating, in Mr. Gladstone's words, that the Irish legislature was to be "subject in all things to the Imperial Parliament, and liable, if need be, to be corrected by it." We held that the fact of subordination was woven into the very substance and texture of our bill; and we held that there was no need to employ a distinctive word, which is not applied to our Colonial legislatures, when the thing which the word represents was abundantly secured. But it was not difficult for the enemies of Home Rule to make it appear as if, in rejecting the word, we had rejected the thing; and the effects which this misrepresentation produced led me to think that we had made a mistake in rejecting the word.

In the third place, the internal disputes of the Irish Party to some extent alienated English sympathy from their cause; and finally the bulk of our voters, even while they still adhered to Home Rule, were heartily tired of the whole subject. Ireland, Scotland, and Wales have repeatedly declared in favor of our Irish policy; but,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as Lord Rosebery rightly said, in a much-misrepresented phrase, "the predominant member of the partnership of the Three Kingdoms" must be much more thoroughly converted before that policy can be translated into fact.

6. The sixth cause was the influence of the Established Church. The parochial clergy of my Division were, as far as I know, universally opposed to me. Their opposition was, I am sure, thoroughly conscientious, and, as I am a stanch advocate of Disestablishment, was not to be wondered at. The influence of pastoral admonitions, appeals to religious sentiment, visits of Church workers, and the like, was probably great. All, however, was conducted so decently and discreetly that I am unable to estimate the precise amount of effort put forth, or to gauge its effect. I cannot believe that the simple villagers were told by the inhabitants of the vicarage that I wished to pull down the parish church, or that any one who voted for me would have to look elsewhere than to the vicarage for coals at Christmas or soup in illness. Scarcely more credible is the report that a great lady in the county announced that her country house would be closed, and all the material benefits which flow from it into the village suspended, if the Liberal candidate were returned. Scarcely credible, I say, are these stories; and yet I am afraid we must confess that here in England the women of the privileged classes have not yet learned to play the game of politics with strict regard for the rules of fair play; and that they cannot always resist the temptation to promote even a sacred cause by poisonous whispers and untraceable innuendoes directed against the character and private life of the candidate whom they oppose.

7. Our record of work during our three years of power did not powerfully affect the imagination of the voters. They look for results. They are never impressed by the plea of parliamentary obstruction. They expect a Government to govern, and a majority to prevail. They regarded the time spent in the House of Commons on bills which the Lords rejected as pure waste; and even our best handiwork did not serve us much. The poor did not feel the benefit of Sir William Harcourt's great Budget. Mr. Asquith's admirable Factory Act did not appeal to rural voters; and our Parish Councils Act did us positive and twofold harm. It disappointed the laborers, who have not so far derived as much advantage from it as we had led them to expect; and it disgusted the farmers who had been rejected when they stood for the Councils of their respective parishes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

8. The circumstances of the dissolution were unlucky. Country people could not understand why we should resign office because of a snatched vote on an administrative detail. The fact that we resigned instead of dissolving deprived us of the opportunity of appealing to the country on some clear and definite issue. We waited to take the position of the attacking party; and Lord Salisbury's sagacious plan of dissolving in silence, without pledge, promise, or programme, left us nothing to attack. Thus we had to go to the country, neither affirming nor denying, neither constructing nor destroying,—and the country seemed disposed to ask why we came to it at all.

9. I have taken out of its chronological order, and reserved for the last place in the list of our causes of defeat, that which was by far the most potent of all. Every cause which I have enumerated did us a greater or less degree of harm, but all of them together could not have ruined us without the assistance of the Local Veto Bill. I record this opinion with unfeigned regret. "Driven," in Mr. Gladstone's phrase, "by the slow and resistless forces of conviction," I have for twelve years advocated the establishment of local and popular control over the traffic in intoxicating liquors. I have done so both because I believed that it would tend to diminish drunkenness by lessening the temptation to drink, and because I regarded it as a natural and necessary part of any genuine system of local self-government. On those grounds I advocated it at the election of 1892, and ever since at the long series of meetings which I have addressed between that time and this. I have spoken in towns and villages of every size; to some hundred meetings of my own supporters; and in a dozen constituencies besides my own I have addressed crowded audiences of enthusiastic Liberals, who took up every point with ready apprehension, and signified their sympathy by the most emphatic tokens. Each successive point in our Liberal programme elicited louder cheers than the last,—until we came to Local Veto. Then a deathly gloom came down, like a thick cold fog, upon the meeting, and seemed to choke the speaker. Every man who has the faculty or the habit of public speech speaks, as it were, with his finger on the pulse of his audience; he feels, almost before the words are out of his mouth, whether or not the pulse vibrates sympathetically. In discoursing of Local Veto, the speaker felt in vain for that responsive vibration; nay, the pulse seemed to elude his touch; he and his hearers were for the moment separated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by an intervening cloud which no rhetoric could pierce. Where, five minutes before, all had been enthusiasm, approval, sympathy, and applause, there was now the silence of the tomb, or at the most a lonely cheer from a little knot of convinced teetotallers.

Now this marked and unmistakable disapprobation was not directed against the particular bill which Sir William Harcourt had lately introduced,—a much better one, let me hasten to add, than its predecessors, inasmuch as it provided for limitation as well as prohibition. That bill was vulnerable in several points, which its enemies were not slow to detect; but it is needless to indicate these now, because what the voters objected to, so far as I could see, was not this or that detail, but the very principle on which the bill was founded. "We don't want to have our public-house shut up,"—was the cry of the rural voter; and everything which tended in the direction of veto he cordially mistrusted and disliked. Of course it was easy enough to correct misrepresentations of our bill; to point out that we were only giving to the community the power which the irresponsible magistrates now have; to show that, instead of "robbing a poor man of his beer," we were giving him the key of his own cellar: it was all in vain,—nothing could make the idea of Local Veto go down. If the Act was not to be enforced, it was folly to pass it: if it was, the poor man would be the sufferer. That was, so far as I could see, the universal feeling; and when we remember that the agricultural laborer has practically no amusement except the public-house, and no physical enjoyments except beer and tobacco, can even the most rigid moralist among us blame him if he looks askance at legislation which would imperil those cherished alleviations of his daily toil?

For my own part, I remain a firm believer in the principle of Local Control, and I only wish I were not obliged to admit that the bulk of my countrymen seem blind to its merits. In this matter of the reform of the liquor laws, as in so many others, it is true that the Liberal Party has fallen by its own virtue. We have loved righteousness and hated iniquity. We have attacked abuses wherever we saw them; and all the powers of evil have been banded together to resist our onslaught.

In this enumeration of causes of defeat, it will be observed that I have said nothing about the action of the Independent Labor Party, or the attitude of the Roman Catholic voters toward Denominational Education. Other candidates might have much to say on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these topics, but they do not enter into my personal experience. Intimidation, lies, and bribery by means of free beer no doubt played a great part; but unhappily they are of too constant occurrence at our elections to call for special comment here.

I may be asked, if these causes ruined us, what would have helped us? I answer briefly:

(*a*) A reasonable system of old-age pensions, discriminating between the deserving and the undeserving.

(*b*) Electoral reform (one man, one vote; a shorter period of qualifying residence; all elections on one day).

(*c*) A combined, authorized, and resolute attack on the wrecking power of the House of Lords. In putting this in the forefront of his policy, my friend and leader, Lord Rosebery, showed, in my humble judgment, that he knew the temper of the Liberal party; and it is much to be regretted that our abrupt retirement from office interfered with a concerted movement of the whole Liberal army against the irresponsible power of hereditary lawmakers.

But I have already answered the Editor's question, and I must not go on supplementing my reply with unsolicited opinions.

GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"WHY, WHENCE, AND WHITHER?"

I HAVE taken the question which forms the title of this article from some words which Carlyle borrrowed or translated from Goethe. Why did we have the general election just now?—Whence came the results that we all can see only too clearly?—and Whither is the change of government to bring us?

I may as well confess that I for one was surprised at the result of the election,—at the overwhelming victory it has given to the Tory party. Yet perhaps I ought not to have been surprised. Everybody—or almost everybody—on both sides of the House of Commons was saying that if the Liberal Government had to go out at such a time as the present, the Liberals would be defeated at a general election by a crushing majority. Possibly I am somewhat skeptical as to political prophecies, and I am inclined to believe that what everybody—or almost everybody—predicts is not likely to come true. Not many days before the dissolution I had some talk in the House of Commons with Sir Richard Temple, a strong Tory, but a very clear-headed observer of political affairs. He assured me that the Tories would come into power with a majority of a hundred. I scoffed at the idea. I was quite mistaken, as scoffers generally are. Sir Richard Temple's estimate was not beyond the truth. No such wave of reaction to Conservatism has drenched the country since the general election of 1874.

Then, as now, the dissolution of Parliament came upon the public as a surprise. It will not, perhaps, be without interest for American readers if I give a few lines of description of that catastrophe, which Mr. Gladstone himself said in the House of Commons, at the opening of the new Parliament, showed a larger transfer of seats from one party to another than had ever occurred since 1831. The dissolution in 1874 was brought about by Mr. Gladstone's own hand. He had had some five years of power. He had a giant's strength, and he had used it like a giant. At no former time were so many great measures of genuine reform forced through in the same administration as it was the success of Mr. Gladstone to accomplish between

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the close of 1868 and the opening of 1874. But at the latter date he began to see that the reform movement was wearing itself out. The impulse which he had given had spent its strength. England proper is, on the whole, a country of Conservatives. It is kept up to its reform work by the voting power of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. In England, the landlord class; the rich people; the well-to-do *bourgeoisie;* the folks who really belong to society, and the folks who try to pass off as belonging to it; the inhabitants of seaside villa residences; the shopkeepers and traders of all kinds who flourish on the patronage of the higher orders; and most of the professional classes, —these and many other sets are as a rule distinctly conservative. Mr. Gladstone, then, saw in 1874 that the tide was already turning against him and his great reforming projects. Two or three by-elections went to the advantage of the Tories, and he suddenly made up his mind to appeal to the country and have the whole question settled by a general election. The results of that election proved disastrous to the Liberal party, and Mr. Gladstone was out of office for six years. This later time the suddenness of the general election was nearly as great a surprise to the country as in 1874. It was brought about by what we call a "snap division" in the House of Commons, to which nobody at first seemed disposed to attach the slightest importance. Lord Rosebery's Government nevertheless took it to heart, and resolved to resign office, and the Queen without remonstrance accepted their resignation. Lord Salisbury formed a new Administration and straightway appealed to the country,—and we see how the country has made answer to the appeal.

What were the principal causes of this almost complete revolt against Liberalism? The causes were many; the influences were complex. In the first place there was the inevitable fading of popular enthusiasm which came when the magnificent figure of Mr. Gladstone was no longer to be seen in the front of the fight. The man does not live who could really take Mr. Gladstone's place. "Measures, not men," is a sound political axiom; and when political life is wholly made up of philosophers, then indeed people will doubtless only consider as to the value of a measure and not as to the inspiring genius of a man. But that time has not yet arrived, and it is therefore not surprising if the withdrawal of Mr. Gladstone from public life should have left a blank and a chill behind it. Then the condition of Lord Rosebery's health prevented him at a most critical time from being a fighting Prime Minister. He was compelled by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no fault of his own to be little more than a phantom statesman. All that had a depressing effect upon the public. Sir William Harcourt —a fighting statesman if ever such there were—did gladiatorial work in the House of Commons, but somehow he has never succeeded in obtaining a wide and genial personal popularity. What was of much more importance, however, was that Sir William Harcourt had given out that he was determined to attach the fortunes of himself and his party to the fate of the Local Veto bill. This bill is a scheme to give to localities in England the power, by means of a certain majority, of abolishing or reducing the number of public-houses.

As everybody knows, the liquor traffic in England is one of the mightiest of all vested interests. The influence of the advocates of temperance, who are led by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, is undoubtedly very strong, and has the almost universal support of the "Nonconformist conscience"; but as a rule men may be trusted to fight more stiffly for a personal interest than for a public principle. There are also in England large numbers of quiet persons who detest drunkenness as much as any of their neighbors can, but who do not see why a dozen moderate drinkers should be interfered with because one man drinks too much. Many people take the same general view of the subject that I take myself. I should probably have voted for the Local Veto bill as an honest attempt to deal with a terrible social evil, not only because I thought any reasonable experiment worth trying, but also because I like the principle which gives to localities a control over their own affairs. I should, however, have given my vote without any real faith in the success of such a measure. For many years I took a keen interest in watching the working of similar legislation in the United States and Canada, and I was not encouraged to hope for much from the operation of any such law. My impression is that, outside the professed teetotallers and some of the ministers of every denomination in England, nobody cared about the measure except those who thoroughly detested it, and who felt that their trade interests were seriously threatened. Two or three months ago I asked an eminent member of the Liberal party in the House of Commons whether he did not think that the Local Veto bill might very well be put off for another ten years, and received the emphatic answer: "It might very well be put off for another fifty years, and then we should probably find that we were not in need of it." Now I am not going to argue the question of repressive or suppressive legislation as regards the sale of intoxicating drinks, but I am trying

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to describe the feelings of the various sections of the English people with regard to the Local Veto bill. Everybody knew that the bill had not for the present the remotest chance of being passed into law. The Irish Nationalists were naturally dissatisfied when they saw that Sir William Harcourt had tied the fortunes of his Administration to a measure which could not be carried, but the mere discussion of which would necessarily push the Home Rule question into the background. There thus grew up among many of the Liberals, and among most or all of the Nationalists, the disheartening thought that, as the vessel is certain to be wrecked, it matters little upon what rock she runs. I have never been able to understand why the steersman should at the very opening of the voyage have chosen a sort of Jaffa port with a ridge of rocks ahead. Let us see what was the ridge of rocks in front of that political port of Jaffa. My readers who have been to Jaffa will understand my metaphor.

The State Church of England is still a very strong corporation, and its members now make common cause with the State Church in Wales, as at one time they did with the State Church in Ireland,—that Church which Mr. Gladstone disestablished and disendowed. One of the measures taken up by the late Liberal Government was a bill for the disestablishment of the State Church in Wales, on the reasonable ground that the vast majority of the Welsh people do not recognize its teaching or attend its services. Of course the usual cry of what professes to be outraged religion was instantly raised in England, and the brewer and the publican soon found that in the work of overthrowing the Government they had a stalwart and an indomitable ally in the militant churchman. The cry of "the Church in danger" has always been a powerful battle-note in the politics of Great Britain since the days of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel. It was never louder or stronger as a rallying-call than during the late struggle. Here, then, we have two tremendous influences arrayed against the cause of progressive Liberalism in England. The publican, and what Dean Swift or Sydney Smith would have called the parson, were fighting side by side, although not exactly hand in hand. Very likely the parson in his secret heart detested the publican, and I have no reason to believe that the publican had any particular affection for the parson. But when it came to a fight against a Liberal Government, the two could work together in unholy and unacknowledged alliance. Thus we have two of the very strongest influences in English social life acting in thorough unison

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the efforts of a reforming Government. The publican would have been strong by himself, but joined with the parson he bore down all his enemies. The same may be said of the parson. He would have had a certain strength as a fighting politician if left to himself, although not nearly so much as the publican. All the great efforts for reform in Church systems in these countries have been carried despite the opposition of the parson. Still he could have made a fight and given trouble, if left to his own fighting powers alone. But when his political enemies handed over to him the support of the publican he must have felt that one triumph at least was to be his.

I am assured by many of Sir William Harcourt's friends that he was positively convinced that the Local Veto bill was the one measure about which the English people really cared. I can quite understand his anxiety to bring in some measure which should really arouse the enthusiasm of the English people,—I mean personal and local enthusiasm. The English Liberals have been nobly loyal to Home Rule and to Welsh Disestablishment, but the interest which the English public take in such measures is impersonal, is reflected or refracted, and an English statesman would naturally feel anxious to give them something for themselves. This, no doubt, was the anxiety of Sir William Harcourt. But how he could ever have persuaded himself that a Local Veto bill was a measure to arouse such enthusiasm passes my understanding. I had many a talk with leading Liberal politicians, during recent days, about this measure and its chances of present success; but I never spoke with any one, except Sir Wilfrid Lawson and a few of his supporters, who did not shake their heads over it, and express, as their brightest hope, their doubt whether Sir William Harcourt would really press it after all.

He did not press it. It did not get a chance of being pressed. The snap division came, and the Government made up its mind to go out of office at once. But the Local Veto bill had a good deal to do with that making up of the Administration's mind. Many a member of the Cabinet doubtless said to himself: "We had better go out now than on the Local Veto bill. We are certain to be defeated on that measure, and it will make us so unpopular that it will really be to our advantage to throw up the sponge at once and get out of the whole responsibility." The trouble was that they could not evade the responsibility they had themselves undertaken. The vengeance of the liquor trade pursued them,—for had they not introduced the Local Veto bill, and had not Sir William Harcourt announced that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he was determined to press it? "*Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas immolat.*" In this battle, however, there were two Pallases,—Pallas publican and Pallas parson.

In this controversy about the Local Veto bill, the result of which was seen in the elections, there were many honorable and high-minded men who utterly refused to be bound by their trade interests. There were members of the Liberal party who held a place among the greatest brewers of the day, and who yet were determined to support the Liberal Government because on the whole it was a Government whose policy worked for the general benefit of the state. A friend and political colleague of my own, a man at the head of one of the largest distilling manufactories of Ireland, declared it to be his sturdy intention to vote for the Home Rule Ministry, come what would of the Local Veto. All the same the Liberal Government was turned out of office mainly because of that Local Veto. The mistake was one of perspective and proportion. The general public—the public that was not pledged in advance to glorify it or to detest it—had not made up its mind on the subject,—could not believe that any such measure was really coming on in good earnest. For a great many successive years we used to have Sir Wilfrid Lawson's annual measure for the establishment of Local Option—the Permissive Bill, it was called. It was debated, many good speeches were made about it, and it used to get a considerable number of votes. More than one member of the House of Commons has told me in the frankest way that he voted for the bill because it could not possibly come to anything, and he did not like to seem as if he were discouraging the advocates of temperance. Once at least since I became a member of the House,—I think it was in 1880,—a resolution in favor of Local Veto was actually carried by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, by a majority of twenty-six. But every one who knows anything about the House of Commons knows what a vast difference there is between a resolution carried by a private member and a measure taken up by a Government. The passing of the resolution did not alarm the publican, but it became a serious business indeed to them when the principle of Local Veto was embodied in a measure by a Liberal Government, whose leader in the House of Commons announced his determination to press it forward as quickly as possible. Then the tug of war seemed sure to come. It would have come on that issue but for the snap resolution. But the actual fight occurred as if that resolution had never been carried. No publican in the kingdom cared a penny

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about the snap resolution. He avenged himself and his interests on the Local Veto bill by his vote at the polling-booth.

Not Home Rule, then, but the Local Veto bill, has been the defeat of the Liberal Government. But it is hardly necessary to say that most of the Tories—and especially the country Tories—detested the idea of Home Rule, and were glad to have any opportunity of voting against the statesmen who had introduced it and actually carried it through the House of Commons. What I mean to say is, that if the fortune of war had allowed us to fight the elections on the simple and straightforward question of Home Rule, the probabilities are that the Liberals would have come back to office with a strong majority. It must also be remembered that among a large proportion of what I may call the inactive voters of England there is a strong and apparently inborn aversion to change of any kind. "Let us have no meandering," said the good old lady in "David Copperfield." She was opposed to all travelling from one's birthplace for any purpose whatever. She would not condescend to argue the question, but settled the whole matter by the repetition of her precept—"Let us have no meandering." "Let things remain as they are," is the precept and principle of a considerable proportion of every English constituency. A stout old Tory squire once turned to me in the House of Commons at a time when the Government—a Liberal Government—was bringing in some perfectly unexceptionable bill for the remedying of a merely technical defect in some rather unimportant measure, and said in a voice of genuine reproach and pain, "Can they never let anything remain as it was,—these Radicals?" He undoubtedly expressed the general feeling of a large number of English voters. Many years ago Richard Cobden declared that the English were the Chinese of Europe. Every Liberal Government has to reckon with these European Chinamen. They make excellent sand-bag fortifications for the defence of good old abuses. Such men as these would have objected to the Local Veto bill without the slightest reference to its merits or demerits. They would not have troubled themselves about the publican's interest or the publican's demand for compensation for disturbance. They would simply have said, "This is a new thing, and so we don't want it." Again, we must take into account another considerable section of Englishmen who, without any particular concern for the doings of this Government or that, always like a change at the end of three or four years. Add to this the palpable, visible operation of the law of action and reaction in English political life,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and it will be seen that the parson and the publican found many ready supporters at the general election who were tied to neither side by any feeling of principle or bond of common interest.

There were elements of dissension between the Liberal Administration and certain sections of the public which I may mention, but which do not call for any lengthy description. A cry was raised against the Liberals to the effect that they were favoring the introduction of cheap foreign goods to the injury of the British manufacturer. "Made in Germany" became a slang phrase of the day, and a slang phrase is often a barbed arrow at a great electoral crisis. Many of the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland believed that they had not had justice in the matter of Catholic education, and that they were put on terms of disadvantage as compared with their Protestant neighbors. The injustice certainly was and is there, so far as I can form any opinion; and I think that the late Government might have remedied it long ago. This made another subject of contention, and many Catholics abstained from voting at all, while a certain small proportion here and there probably gave their votes for the Tories, who had been quietly telling of the wonderful things they would do if they were only helped into office. I suppose we must also reckon in the unfortunate dispute which was forced upon the majority of the Irish Nationalist party, and the utterly absurd and unfounded charges which were made against the chairman and the committee of the party. I shall not say anything on this subject—seeing that I might not be considered a quite impartial authority—except that the controversy, coming in the very thick of a general election, naturally turned many an English voter against us. The charges were caught up and reëchoed for that purpose by all the Tory papers. No doubt many a well-meaning Englishman, who had neither time nor opportunity for going into the nature and validity of the accusations, said to his friends,—"Look at those Irish,—quarrelling among themselves again! Are they fit for Home Rule?"—and then went and voted against the Liberal party. Many another Englishman, animated by the same feeling, if he did not actually vote against the Liberals, stayed at home upon the polling-day and gave no vote at all, and thus let the Tories have it all their own way.

I must not omit from the list of those who consciously or unconsciously contributed to the fall of the Government, the members of the small section which calls itself the Independent Labor party. This very small party is a kind of trades' union, and its principles

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and policy are to put their claims in advance of all other interests and without regard to any other interest. Their creed, so far as I can make it out, is a kind of vague and groping Socialism, which, however, they propose to work out by purely constitutional means. In pursuance of their one idea they ran candidates of their own at the late elections in constituencies where it was evident that if any votes could be drawn away from the Liberals the Tories must have the seat. Therefore they succeeded in getting in many a Tory who would otherwise have been certainly left out. The candidates of the Independent Labor party had in most instances no hope whatever of success for themselves. But they put themselves in evidence and showed what they could do in the way of thwarting the Liberals. Not a single member of the Independent Labor party, so far as I know, has been elected to the new Parliament, although in the last Parliament they had several representatives. Even their leader, the eccentric Mr. Keir Hardie, has been rejected this time. The American reader must always bear in mind that this party does not include such men as Mr. Burt, Mr. Broadhurst, and Mr. John Burns,—sterling and fearless representatives indeed of the laboring class to which they belong, but who are willing to admit that others have claims and rights as well as they; who will help a neighbor to-day in the hope that they may have his help to-morrow; and who are willing to accept the general principle of one thing at a time until it be finished. The Independent Labor party worked very hard at the late elections, and if they were anxious to help in throwing out the Liberals they must feel well satisfied with their share in the accomplishment of that result. If every small party were to act upon the same principle, there could be no legislative reform in England.

It will be seen that a good many of the stars in their courses fought against the Liberal statesmen; but when the stars thus do fight against some mortal they can hardly do it by any organized concert among themselves,—their distances from each other being rather too considerable to admit of any such plan of action. The forces which fought against the late Government were, in their own way, rather too remote from each other to make one combined scheme of attack possible. The parson did not deliberately combine with the publican, nor the publican with the "fair trade" advocate; nor the latter with the Roman Catholic who was dissatisfied with the manner of dealing with his schools; nor the Catholic with the Independent Labor man. But all the grievances found a common target,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the Liberal Government, assailed with arrows from so many parts of the one battle-field, sank down defeated and lifeless, and the Tories held the ground.

I have no inclination whatever to dispute the greatness, the completeness, of the Liberal defeat. It was, as Mr. Ruskin once said on a very different subject, not a fall, but a catastrophe. Yet I am not particularly cast down by it. For the great reform measures in which I am chiefly interested it is a delay and nothing more. The Home-Rule cause, for example, will have to wait. But the man who thinks that Home Rule and its movement have been put out of the way by this Tory triumph must be utterly incapable of understanding the forces of a national principle. Amid all our difficulties and dissensions the cause of Home Rule carried off two seats from the Tories of Ulster. In that province, supposed to be the stronghold of Toryism, we have again a majority of the representation in the ranks of Home Rule. Therefore I feel not the slightest fear on that subject. I am sorry that the national cause should be delayed in its movement, but it will not have to wait long—its time will come.

Its time might come sooner than most people expect, if there were only a Disraeli in the Tory party. How did the cities and boroughs of these countries get their household suffrage? They got it because Mr. Disraeli saw clearly that the reform must come in time,—that nothing could long keep it off; and he asked himself, and he afterward asked his party, whether it would not be better, since the thing could not be avoided, that the Tory party should take it up, make the most of it, and live by it. This was immediately after he and the Tories had come back into office in consequence of the defeat of Mr. Gladstone in 1866 on a measure for the extension of the suffrage. Other Tories were simply exulting in the success of the moment; Mr. Disraeli was looking to the future and estimating the momentary success exactly at its worth. So in 1867 he introduced a rather vague sort of Reform bill; he allowed the Radicals to hammer it into an excellent Household Suffrage bill, and he held office until the Irish difficulty—which up to that time he had not much troubled himself to consider—proved too strong for him, and he was defeated on Mr. Gladstone's resolutions in favor of the disestablishment of the Irish State Church. Now, if there were a Disraeli in the present Tory Cabinet, he might well ask himself, and ask his party, whether there could be any serious chance of staving off for long the settlement of the Home Rule question, and, if somebody must settle it,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

why not the Tories? But I doubt if there be any man in the present Cabinet bold enough and long-headed enough for such a venture.

The majority of the Cabinet will probably be quite content with the daily assurances of the Tory papers that Home Rule is dead and buried; that it does not even call for an epitaph; that it will never be heard of again; and that all is well. The same may be said or counted on for many other great reforms, political and social, which the Liberals are pledged to carry out. The Tory Government will get it into their heads that the overthrow of the Liberal Government means an end of all these things, and Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour will be troubled with them no more. Personally I wish they would pluck up courage and give us a taste of genuine old-fashioned Tory rule. There would be no abstentions of Liberal voters during the elections that came next after a period of that sort of administration. Perhaps they will try a little of it in Ireland, but they will hardly try it upon England or Scotland. If they should try it on Ireland they will, it may be, do us a great deal of good in the end, for they will rally us as one man to fight the common enemy. For myself, I would much rather risk coercion than risk disunion, and the first attempt at coercion will be the end of disunion. Defeat, too, will do the English Liberals good. They, as well as we Irish Nationalists, must learn to unite. They—the leaders especially—must get to understand more clearly and with a common recognition exactly what it is that they want to do, and then stick to each task until it is done. I have shown that their recent fall was mainly due to what I cannot help calling divided counsels. There was a want of grip among them; and where there is a want of grip among the leaders there will be a very general laxity of hold among the followers.

Meanwhile Mr. Chamberlain ought, according to the advice given in the famous story told by Herodotus, to sacrifice to the gods his dearest personal possession. For he is uplifted to that most dangerous eminence, the height of his ambition. He is a Secretary of State in a Tory Cabinet,—among the "English gentlemen," for whose society he has yearned so long. He would really do well to read the story of Polycrates and take warning. It can be easily done—there are many English translations of Herodotus.

JUSTIN M'CARTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RENASCENCE IN ENGLISH.

To say that the English language, especially in its literary uses, has within the second half of this century experienced a veritable renascence, may seem to be making a stiff claim. Yet there is much to justify so strong a term and statement, to explain and illustrate which is the business of this paper. The original impulse has come from the specialists, who have devoted themselves to the study of Old English, to the language and literature lying back of the Norman Conquest. The past thirty years have witnessed a wide popularizing of the earlier native literary treasures through their efforts; the principal texts have been edited and translated and lectured about, and their use in schools and colleges encouraged, so that now the graduate from one of our leading and liberally endowed institutions may, if he choose, know his "Beowulf" as his father did his "Horace." These elder classics of the mother tongue have not only been taken into the curricula of instruction, but have been put forth for broader literary appreciation, with the idea of literary stimulation as well as linguistic drill. Then, too, the comparative study of the allied literatures—the output of the Germanic group of German, Dutch, and Scandinavian peoples, of which English is a kinsman—has done its share in shedding light upon our tongue as an organism governed by linguistic laws and possessing powers long unsuspected.

To this cultivation of Old English (at first the province of the few, but rapidly becoming the work and pleasure of the many) may be added the closer study and appreciation of later literary figures and epochs,—Chaucer and the Elizabethans, and Spenser, to say nothing of Shakespeare himself,—together with the marked attention, reaching almost to the dignity of a cult, directed toward the historical English ballad; and last, but by no means least, the increased sensitiveness to the literary quality of the Bible. To anticipate no effect, sooner or later, upon native modern literature, from all the exploitation of the older fields,—allowed, so many of them, to lie fallow for a long period,—is to overlook cause and effect in the developmental interrelations of speech and letters. Nothing could be further from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

truth than to suppose this movement to be a matter of mere literary fashion: it goes far deeper than that. The return to Old English expression (always, of course, within limits of common sense and controlled by custom and convenience) is not a temporary fad, but will prove a permanent enrichment of the force and splendor of the speech. The preference for native words and idioms has grown so marked that it can be recognized plainly in some of our most effective and powerful writers, while signs of it crop out constantly in current literature. One who for the first time turns, for example, to the poetry of William Morris, will find it something not only rich, but strange,—and for this very reason.

One of the principal things taught by this restoration of English to much of its old-time valiency is the tongue's Germanic structure: that primitive ability in word-forms and sentence-construction which the German, its historic cousin, has retained in larger measure. The student of English, in tracing back its line of development, becomes aware that it converges steadily toward this other tongue; so that when the Old English period is reached the investigator is astonished to see how close, compared with the present status of the two languages, is the affiliation with German, in words, forms, and idioms. So true is this, that the student is told that a first requisite for any fruitful pursuance of historic English is the learning of German. But the latter, owing to its different history, has kept its native powers in relative purity; while English, subjected to more disturbing influences in the Norman Conquest and the classic Renascence, has diverged far wider from its normal physiognomy and its original tendencies. As a result of such divergence, where the German uses a native compound like *vorwort*, the English turns to the Latin and makes *preface;* where English domesticates such a repulsive foreign importation as *massacre*, the German uses *blutbad* (blood-bath), a native formation self-explanatory to the most illiterate of the race: and so on with hundreds—even thousands—of other words concerning which it is to be said that had our own tongue encountered a happier linguistic experience it would, quite as readily as its sister-language, have clung to its birthright and privilege in this respect,—word-forming from within, and so keeping the speech pure. And even to-day much (though not all) of this power can be reclaimed, and a realization thereof is bringing it about. Thus, it is not infrequent now that a book by a scholar bears the legend "foreword" instead of the customary "preface": here is plainly enough the effort to rein-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state, by analogy with the German, what might have been very properly the distinctive word from the beginning. To those who have not looked into the matter such a seeming neologism may appear a bit of pedantry, an affectation with no significance; but it is not so, for the great principle of English renascent in accordance with its organic spirit lies behind such a case. As these older words creep into the diction of the scholar aware of the historical facts we have indicated, or are used by the literary worker keenly alive to the strength and fitness of these speech heirlooms, we may be sure that the tendency is wholesome, and one to gather force in the time to come. For it is a return to the simple and the indigenous, an eschewing of the foreign, which has been overlaid like a lacquer upon the native material. Of course many of our foreign-derived words have become so thoroughly anglicized as to make it impossible, no less than unadvisable, to eradicate them. But the method proposed is not the rooting up of what is firmly planted in the speech, but a reintroduction, a calling back of the germane, thereby ousting slowly, unviolently, what is less suitable. It will be, and should be, a case of the survival of the fittest.

The movement once started by the philologists and specialists in language has been, it may be repeated, carried on with vigor by those who make literature. It is in their efforts that the popular rehabilitation of the older and purer elements of English especially may be found. And in this welcome influence poetry rather than prose will always be dominant. It is of the nature and essence of poetical diction to be archaic, to show a large proportion of native words: and this because it is the language of the emotions, which always chooses the homespun and the familiar terms and forms natal in the speech. Words like *home*, *mother*, *father*, *love*, *heart*, and *hearth* —the category of the affections—will in all tongues be recognized as born within its body. And this contribution of poetry, the highest form of literature, to our linguistic treasure-trove, will be supplemented inevitably by the most imaginative prose-writing, since the same law is there at work: the indigenous element strong when the feelings are in considerable measure implicated, the imagination widest awake. A great service is being rendered by the present acceptability of dialect literature: through the attention in fiction to the local "speech-islands," as philologians dub them, the dialectical variations of the common stock of language are brought into notice, and a multitude of words, idioms, and phrases reinstated in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parlance, or at least in the cognizance, of the more sophisticated centres of speech. And since the linguistic survivals of the country-side are more often than not the local persistence of what was once the best English for cultivated and literary usage, the result is a constant enrichment of the modern word-hoard. The counties or colonies of Great Britain, the manifold sections of the United States, have in this way yielded up rich treasures to the skilful hands of the poets and novelists. Never has the local speech been transcribed with a like faithfulness, skill, and attraction. From this cause the tongue will in time become an instrument of wider diapason, more varied in its harmonies, and vibrant with immemorial racial tones. The reader to-day gets a new sense of its possibilities, and is taught hospitably to throw open the doors to fresh material representing local survivals of the sturdy old speech which, by the good graces of literature, then become revivals of our current language.

With this outline sketch of principles, some illustrations, drawn from the various channels of contribution, will make the contention plainer and should prove not uninteresting. Let us take a passage from Dr. Hall's metrical version of "Beowulf," as an example of the sort of English used by a student who essays to present such a monument in a modern dress, yet preserves as much as may be its primitive tang:

> "Fast the days fleeted; the float was a-water,
> The craft by the cliff. Clomb to the prow then
> Well-equipped warriors; the wave-currents twisted
> The sea on the sand; soldiers then carried
> On the breast of the vessel bright-shining jewels,
> Handsome war-armor; heroes out-shoved then,
> Warmen the wood-ship, on its wished-for adventure.
> The foamy-necked floater, fanned by the breeze,
> Likest a bird, glided the waters."

To bring such language into popular consideration is educative and may be counted upon for its influence: the archaic words or forms can readily be picked out: found in the vernacular, they are allowed to remain in the translation: and it is the test of the happy translator how close he clings to the original without growing obscure or offensively odd.

Dr. Furnival, the doughty president of the English Shakespeare Society, is a scholar whose studies might be expected to affect his diction, as indeed they have. In his introduction to an edition of William Harrison's "A Description of England," this wielder of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forthright English speaks of an "unthrift young gentleman," and his description of Harrison as a personality reads thus:

"A business-like, God-fearing, truth-seeking, learned, kind-hearted, and humorous fellow, he seems to me; a good gardener; an antiquarian and numismatist; a true lover of his country; a hater of shams, lazy lubbers, and evil-doers; a man that one likes to shake hands with, across the rift of two hundred years that separates us."

The effect of this upon the reader is of a style plain, familiar, and racy; but, the more it is studied *in extenso*, the clearer is it seen that its quality is due to a bias for the older words and constructions,—a characteristic of Dr. Furnival's manner of writing in general.

Among modern historians none is so remarkable for the Saxon simplicity of his style as Freeman: he carries his preference for the vernacular so far that at times he will repeat the same native word again and again within a few lines rather than use its classic or romance equivalent,—with an effect of baldness and sameness in his diction. It is not surprising that this great historian's burrowing in the past of England and English should have left its mark on his prose: the following passage, from the first lecture in "The English People in Its Three Homes," brings the fact home:

"Here on your soil I am not indeed in mine own home, but I am none the less among mine own folk. I am among men of mine own blood and mine own tongue, sharers in all that a man of either England deems it his pride and happiness to share in. How can we be strangers and foreigners to one another, how can we be other than kinsfolk and brethren of the same hearth, when we think that your forefathers and mine may have sailed together from the oldest England of all in the keels of Hengest or of Cerdic—that they may have lurked together with Ælfred in the marshes of Athelney—that they may have stood side by side in the thick shield-wall on the hill of Senlac—that they may have marched together as brethren to live and die for English freedom alike on the field of overthrow at Evesham and on the field of victory at Naseby?"

Here, again, I am aware, the general physiognomy of style is that of a homely, strong simplicity, having, however, an eloquence all its own: here, it might be said, is no revamping of the tongue, but only a straightforward manipulation of English unadorned. Yet such a style is an exceedingly rare phenomenon; it may be stated boldly that an example of it thirty years ago cannot be found in English. Only from one who had drunk deep draughts from the purest sources of our speech could such felicitous handling of its Germanic powers have come. Mr. Freeman, in the book quoted from, bears down on our close relationship to the Germans and Dutch, respectively second

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and first cousins. Speaking of the "tie" which binds the English of the British isles to that ancient England of the continent whence they came, he acknowledges that it may not be at first evident, and "does not force itself upon the mind by the most obvious witness of language, of history, of all that makes divided brethren to be brethren still. But the tie is still real: it is still living." He is thinking here of other things than language, but his words apply thereto in full force.

Other modern historians, whose style is strong on the native side, —men like Green and Froude and Harrison,—furnish examples, though not in so striking a degree as Freeman, of the influence upon personal diction of delvings in the bygone life and language. A glance at some modern poets may be taken, to strengthen the impression; and no man may fitlier head the list than William Morris, whose verse, as already hinted, is notable in this matter of good old English. I draw on his great story-cycle, "The Earthly Paradise," a stanza from "The Man Born to Be King:"

"So long he rode he drew anigh
A mill upon the river's brim,
That seemed a goodly place to him,
For o'er the oily smooth millhead
There hung the apples growing red,
And many an ancient apple-tree
Within the orchard could he see,
While the smooth millwalls white and black
Shook to the great wheel's measured clack
And grumble of the gear within;
While o'er the roof that dulled that din
The doves sat crooning half the day,
And round the half-cut stack of hay
The sparrows fluttered twittering."

We have chosen this earlier unobtrusive example of a happy use of the native English elements in verse rather than one from the later, more pronouncedly archaic, and to some artificially Germanic, work of Morris, though this richly illustrates the principle. This natural *trouvère* may be called a pioneer of the linguistic renascence when it is remembered that the chief poem-group of his life dates from 1868–70. And with him may properly be set Swinburne: he too exhibits in his verse, in his diction and metres as well, the strong influence upon him of the root-flavors of speech: though in his case a softer, more voluptuous effect is gained by the intermingling of classic elements. Take these stanzas of his magnificent pæan, "The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Armada," and see how well-nigh every word of it is home-born and monosyllabic,—a fact making its rhythmic flow all the more wonderful and its force the more potent:

"Greed and fraud, unabashed, unawed, may strive to sting thee at heel in vain:
Craft and fear and mistrust may leer and mourn and murmur and plead and plain:
Thou art thou: and thy sunbright brow is hers that blasted the strength of Spain.

Mother, mother beloved, none other could claim in place of thee England's place:
Earth bears none that beholds the sun so pure of record, so clothed with grace:
Dear our mother, nor son nor brother is thine as strong or as fair of face.

How shalt thou be abased? or how shall fear take hold of thy heart? of thine,
England, maiden immortal, laden with charge of life and with hopes divine?
Earth shall wither, when eyes turned hither behold not light in her darkness shine.

England, none that is born thy son, and lives, by grace of thy glory, free,
Lives and yearns not at heart and burns with hope to serve as he worships thee;
None may sing thee: the sea-wind's wing beats down our songs as it hails the sea."

Mr. Stedman speaks of Morris as showing how well "our Saxon English is adapted for the transmission of the Homeric spirit:" a fair characterization also of much of Swinburne's lyric and dramatic writing.

Compared with these men in their typical manner, the poetry of the great earlier men—Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, and Shelley—shows a startling difference in regard to the relative prominence of native English words and formations. They had not the advantage of the popularization of younger literature which has since transpired. And the latter-day bards, the generation subsequent to the Morris-Swinburne time, reveal this influence more and more, just in proportion as they are virile and awake to larger possibilities for melody and harmony now open to English.

Of American singers Sidney Lanier is unique in his sensitiveness to Old English language and literature, coloring all his work and giving it a distinctive stamp. The fine couplet—

"By so many roots as the marsh-grass sends in the sod,
I will heartily lay me a-hold on the greatness of God."

—is representative of his style; and this stanza of the "Ballad of Trees and the Master" stands, in its Saxon directness, for much more:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Into the woods my Master went,
Clean forspent, forspent.
Into the woods my Master came,
Forspent with love and shame.
But the olives they were not blind to Him,
The little gray leaves were kind to Him;
The thorn-tree had a mind to Him
When into the woods He came."

Stevenson too, and Kipling, whether as poets or prosers, are of this goodly company; the very title of the former's "Underwoods" is eloquent of these older speech memories, while in that lyric repository is the perfect "Requiem," with its now renewed pathos, each several word of which is English unadulterated, with the one exception of the word *verse:*

REQUIEM.

Under the wide and starry sky,
Dig the grave and let me lie.
Glad did I live and gladly die,
And I laid me down with a will.

This be the verse you grave for me:
Here he lies where he longed to be;
Home is the sailor, home from sea,
And the hunter home from the hill.

Kipling also, among those enchanting provocative interludes of rhyme which are to be found in his prose books, has this bit which clings to the native side of the mother tongue in a fashion typical of this virile young maker of measures and spinner of yarns:

"Oh, was I born of womankind, and did I play alone?
For I have dreamed of playmates twain that bit me to the bone.
And did I break the barley bread and steep it in the tyre?
For I have dreamed of a youngling kid new riven from the byre,
An hour it lacks and an hour it lacks to the rising of the moon;
But I can see the black roof-beams as plain as it were noon."

Nor is this bent for pure English confined to the "chiels" of the rising generation: it is symptomatic, and the open-eyed reader meets with it on all sides. In a poem by Graham R. Tomson occurs the line—

"And all her talk was of some *outland* rare"

—a direct parallelism with the German *ausland.* In Bliss Carman's fine Stevenson Threnody, "A Sea-mark," there are half-a-dozen signs of this desire or instinct—which comes to the same thing—for resus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

citating latent powers to the freshening and beautifying of latter-day vocabulary and construction. Thus:

"But I have *wander-biddings* now."

"You brethren of the *light-heart* guild,
The mystic *fellowcraft* of joy."

"A valiant *earthling* stark and dumb."

"The *journey-wonder* on his face."

"Heart-high, *outbound for otherwhere.*"

—the italics indicating phrasing which shows this promising American verseman to have learned the time's lesson in linguistics.

And prose literature, notably fiction, adds richly to the evidential material, dialect (as explained) being a main source of contribution. Again Stevenson and Kipling are in the van. In "Dr. Jekyl and Mr. Hyde," the story which first drew popular attention to one who had long before revealed to the judicious an artist's hand, may be found half-a-dozen places which illustrate the tendency to fall back upon the ancient privileges of a tongue of which he was past-master: as where "a sharp *intake* of the breath" is spoken of. Some of the matchless descriptive writing in "The Ebb-Tide" affords occasion for more or less in the same sort, as here:

"There was little or no morning bank. A brightening came in the east: then a wash of some ineffable, faint, nameless hue between crimson and silver: and then coals of fire. These glimmered awhile on the sea-line and seemed to brighten and darken and spread out; and still the night and the stars reigned undisturbed. It was as though a spark should catch and glow and creep along the foot of some heavy and almost incombustible wall-hanging, and the room itself be scarce menaced. Yet a little after, and the whole east glowed with gold and scarlet, *and the hollow of heaven was filled with the daylight.*"

Here there is the magic blending of native and imported elements to make a truly admirable style; but ever and anon (as in the italicized closing words) Stevenson places before the ravished observer a compound or turn of expression or sentence which has a relish of old time and the sanction of bygone generations.

Kipling, too, is cunning in the same fashion, allowing, of course, for the personal equation. Take the following from "A Matter of Fact," one of his most grewsomely imaginative tales:

"As he spoke the fog was blown into shreds, and we saw the sea, gray with mud, rolling on every side of us and empty of all life. Then in one spot it bubbled and became like the pot of ointment that the Bible speaks of. From that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wide-ringed trouble a Thing came up—a gray and red Thing with a neck,—a Thing that bellowed and writhed in pain."

The illustrations from current fiction-makers who have turned dialect to literary uses is legion, and an embarrassment of riches the result: examples are hardly necessary, so obvious is this aspect of the movement. In Raymond's delightful Somersetshire idyl, "Tryphena in Love," we find, "And *to-year* she was meeting with wonderful good luck,"—the remark being the author's own, not a part of the dialogue. *To-year* survives in dialectical service (like countless other words) and is common enough in the Elizabethan dramatists and further back: it may be seen that, by analogy with *to-day* and *to-morrow*, it is a capital formation, a regrettable loss to modern English. Mr. Raymond, in the preface to his volume of short stories, "Love and Quiet Life," speaks of this locution, and adds: "And what is the distinguishing initial vowel of the past-participle of the rustic, but a heritage from our Saxon [he means Old English] ancestors,"—going on to point out the resemblance between the countryman's prefix, *a*, as in *a-want*, and the German *ge* in *gewandt*. Ever and again the German comparison forces itself on the student. In Justin H. M'Carthy's pleasing novel, "A Woman of Impulse" (which may be read as the antidote to "Dodo"), I find him speaking of "a ballad with the *overword*,"—also a strictly Germanic compound.

It is hardly necessary to illustrate from the Scotch word-work of Barrie, Crockett, and their commensals, since, of all the dialect loosely grouped under the convenient name "Scotch," it may be declared that it is strongly conservative northern English: that is a fair description, historically, of the variations in English to the north of the Firth. Scotch proper, it may be added, is Celtic,—quite another thing. But the more conventional speech of these two writers, as well as of others like Quiller Couch and Hardy and Blackmore, furnishes food for our thesis. Here, for example, are the very opening sentences of Barrie's "A Window in Thrums":

"On the bump of green round which the brae twists, at the top of the brae and within cry of T'nowhead Farm, still stands a one-story house, whose white-washed walls, streaked with the discoloration that rain leaves, look yellow when the snow comes. In the old days the stiff ascent left Thrums behind, and where is now the making of a suburb was only a poor row of dwellings and a manse, with Hendry's cot to watch the brae."

Quiet, unforced English, this; but when you come to compare it with that of an immediate earlier generation, it is not hard to notice the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change. Or read this from Nora Hopper's strangely poetic "Ballads in Prose," where the influence is Celtic of the Irish order, and the stylistic model Malory's "Morte d'Arthur":

"And when next Cuchullin woke from his dreams he found that Ineen still held him fast, though she was dead and cold: and with some difficulty he loosed her hands from him, and dug with his sword a grave for her in the sand, and there he laid her sorrowfully, praying Angus, the Master of Love, to keep her soul in his Golden House, and Manannan MacLir to hold his waves aloof from her sleeping-place. And when he visited the place with Eimer after a year and a day, they found that the sea had fallen back for half a league, and that the place where the sea-girl slept was a broad space of grass, and in the midst of the grass rose white spikes of meadow-sweet, the flower which for the sake of a forgotten love and a forgotten sacrifice is called of us to-day Crios Chuchulainn (Cuchullin's Belt)."

That in the movement here-above sketched certain influences have been long at work, has been conceded frankly, and those influences named. Nevertheless, that a strong added impulsion has come from the popularization of Old English language and literature, signs of which are easy to be seen, is a plain matter to the student and lover of his native speech. Sometimes it shows in the literary regeneration of a word which for centuries has lain *perdu;* sometimes through the introduction of an idiom out of strict analogy with the German; again, by the elevation of dialect to a more urbane place in the tongue; most often by a widespread tendency toward monosyllabic Anglo-Saxon. But, whatever the manifestations, all hark back to a common cause, stand for one phenomenon; and it may be affirmed of the younger writers, whether using the grand old mother-tongue in America, in England, or in any one of the great colonies where she is at home, those we are coming to look upon as torch-bearers are the best exemplars of this hopeful characteristic, it being, in sooth, one reason of their strength and place in the forefront. A point to be borne down upon is the difference between this movement and sundry fashions in the language of literature and life which have their little day from time to time in various countries. Such was the Elizabethan Euphuism, the Spanish Gongorism, the Marianism of Italy, the *Schwulstigkeit* of the Germans, the Parisian preciosity ridiculed by Molière. A common hall-mark of all these is affectation; they have a narrow aloofness, are superficial and temporary, averse from what is genuinely natural and national, whereas the return to the older in English is—allowing for the occasional posing and strained effects of those whose province it is to bring discredit on any tendency good in itself—a going back to what is simple, strong, direct, and vital to our speech instincts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This renascence of English, then, silent but steady, for the most part unsensational, but none the less potent, is to be apperceived to-day, and in the twentieth century will be more apparent. And the very fact that our leading writers wish thus to turn back to native uses and things is, so far as it goes, proof of the race's health, of its solidarity and *esprit de corps*. We may take comfort in it when confronting an alarmist like Nordau: for a general degeneration of the speech would follow any general degeneration of literature; and the testimony of language, just now, directs us to opposite and more cheerful conclusions.

RICHARD BURTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEMAND AND SUPPLY UNDER SOCIALISM.

MANY people regard the roulette-table merely as a means of frivolous and iniquitous dissipation; and any one who is capable of the moral condescension of studying it, which he can best do by playing a system at Monte Carlo, will probably lose his money if he plays for any length of time; but he will find in the table a most vivid illustration of a truth which is connected with chance and gambling in only an accidental way.

Except for the zero, which we need not consider here, the player who stakes on any of the simple chances,—the red or black, the odds or evens, the *passe* or *manque*,—has a chance at any one *coup* which equals that of the table; and what he wins, if he wins, is the precise sum which he has staked. If, however, he loses, he can double; and if he wins the second time, the sum which he wins is the sum which he staked the first time. Thus, if a man sits down to play two *coups*, his chances of winning the amount of his first stake are double his chance of losing it: and this doubling process, at Monte Carlo, where the limit is six thousand francs, he can continue, if he starts with a single five-franc piece, for eleven *coups*. He may lose ten times in succession; but if he wins the eleventh, he gains a five-franc piece—namely the sum of his original stake. A man who sits down to play in this way has eleven chances of winning his original stake, as against the table's one chance.

It may seem, therefore, and it has seemed to countless persons, that a player who plays thus quite alters the original situation, and has successfully circumvented the persons who designed the game. Such theorists, however, overlook what is really the essence of the situation. The player who, beginning with five francs, has lost ten times in succession, may yet recover his losses, and win five francs by his eleventh stake; but this eleventh stake will be more than five thousand francs. He risks five thousand, and has already risked all his former stakes, for the sake of winning five francs. In fact, to gain, by the doubling system, an advantage of eleven to one against the table, the player must be prepared to risk something like ten

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousand francs for the chance of gaining five francs. In other words, a player for a certain number of *coups* can always alter in his own favor the evenness of the original chance; but he can secure this advantage in one way only—namely by paying for it. If he wishes to have eleven chances of winning five francs as against one of losing them, the lowest price at which he could possibly buy this privilege would be to allow the tables one chance in twelve of winning fifty-five francs. Thus, let the player merely play eleven times, and the original equality between the chances of gain and loss is restored. That is to say, in spite of all systems, the game remains, what it obviously is for any single *coup*—a game of hazard.

I have called attention to the roulette-table because it constitutes, in the respect just mentioned, a most vivid analogy to a fact in human life which social reformers either never realize or else constantly forget, just as the inventors of this or that infallible system forget, or have never realized, the corresponding fact at Monte Carlo. That fact is as follows: The fundamental difficulties, the fundamental imperfections of social life, are due to human nature, and inherent in human nature, just as in the game of roulette there inheres the character of hazard; and the different social systems which have been designed by Utopian reformers would—supposing such systems to be put in practice—change the form of these difficulties and imperfections and disguise them; but their essence would remain, and the reformers would still be confronted by them, and confronted by them in an aggravated and far more unmanageable shape.

Of this great truth there is no more important and no clearer example than one supplied by a case in which the socialistic dreamer foolishly imagines himself to have discovered a triumphant contradiction of it. This is the case of supply and demand, and the effect which the relation between these two factors necessarily has on values, on prices, and on wages,—or, in other words, on the subsistence of the manual laborer. Socialists imagine that were all private capital appropriated by the state, and all the products of Ability confiscated,—either to supplement the wages of Labor, or to be used for some public purpose,—the laws of supply and demand would suddenly cease to operate; and that the wages of the men who produced any one kind of article could be adjusted so as to meet what might be considered their reasonable needs, without any reference to the men who produced the other kinds of articles required by the community as a whole, and without any chance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being involved of injuring these last, and of rousing their hostility. Thus, when Socialists are pressed with arguments which relate to demand prices, and when it is argued that the maximum limit of wages for the producers of any given article is fixed, not by how much the men want who produce it, but by how much the article itself is wanted by the men who, it is assumed, will purchase it,—the Socialists, when these arguments are pressed on them, invariably take refuge in saying of them that, if they are true at all, they are true only of society under the existing system; that they are true only—here is one of their favorite phrases—under the "*régime* of cut-throat competition"; or, in a phrase more frequent still, that "there is all the difference in the world between the production of articles for use and consumption, as they would be produced under Socialism, and the production of articles as commodities or for the purpose of exchange, as they are produced now."

Idler and more foolish language than this was never used. I propose to show that, in a socialistic society,—supposing such to be possible,—a society in which the socialistic principles were developed to the very uttermost, the law of supply and demand would make itself felt, not with less force than at present, but with a great deal more; and that were every private capitalist and private employer abolished, all those difficulties and all those conflicts of interest which now manifest themselves in agitations, in lock-outs and in strikes, would manifest themselves afresh in different and yet more destructive forms. The personal disappearance of the private capitalist and employer would merely leave more apparent the enduring and inexpugnable nature of the facts and forces represented by him.

Let us begin by examining the socialistic fallacy in that bald and crude form to which I have just referred. Stated categorically, this fallacy, so often repeated, is as follows:—that the community under the *régime* of Socialism—as the word is now generally understood—*would no longer produce for exchange in the way in which it does now;* or, to put the matter in other words, *it would produce for consumption in some way radically different from the way in which it now produces.* I propose first to point out to the reader that this statement is so absolutely and transparently false, that it could hardly have imposed on any human being, if it were not that it were used to mark two other propositions, equally false, but at first sight more plausible, which propositions I shall proceed then to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

examine. But, before even mentioning these, let us get the original fallacy quite out of our way. Let us make ourselves quite clear that whatever Socialism might do or might not do, it would do nothing to alter the *rationale* of production in this respect; but would leave the producers producing for exchange, just as they are doing at the present moment, and producing for consumption in no other sense than the very real sense in which at the present moment they are producing and necessarily must produce.

In order to understand clearly these two limits of production, let us begin by considering production in its rudest and simplest stages.

An isolated individual, such as Robinson Crusoe, or an isolated family living in a very remote district, may no doubt afford us examples of what the Socialists talk about,—namely, genuine production for consumption, as opposed to production for exchange. The isolated individual will practise every craft for himself. He will be his own husbandman, his own potter, his own clothier, and his own mason. The isolated family will do the same things between them. Each individual will practise several crafts, the result of which will be enjoyed round a single hearth. But the result in each case will be rude and simple in the extreme. This is by no means the state of things which the socialistic reformers contemplate. They do not propose to lose any one of the advantages which communities as a whole have gained by modern industrial progress. They only propose to alter the existing system of production so as to redistribute its results, not to alter its methods; and there is not a single scientific Socialist who does not understand, as fully as Adam Smith did, that of all civilization, of all industrial progress, the great underlying condition is a minute division of labor. Now, if division of labor means anything, it means, before all things, this: that, of the products needed by the very poorest man in the community, of the very necessaries of life which he cannot live without consuming, he shall himself make only a very small part,—perhaps no part at all; but shall make instead something which shall be exchanged for what he consumes. Take, for instance, the case of a sorter at the post-office. He may accidentally sort one letter of his own out of a million; but if he does so this is a mere unimportant accident. His wages do not come to him in the form of any service he thus renders to himself, as they would were he a savage building his own hovel. Or, again, take one of the girls who roll cigarettes in the state tobacco-factories in France. She very probably does not smoke at all; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at all events no appreciable part of her livelihood comes to her in the form of cigarettes which she herself rolls. And these two examples are all the more to the point, in that they are taken from industries which are always pointed to by the Socialists as examples and instalments of Socialism.

The statement, then, of the Socialists that production under Socialism will be production for exchange any less than it is now, is, if we take it as it stands, merely an ignorant or dishonest formula, which will not stand a single moment's examination. We shall find, however, that under the surface this statement covers two meanings, which, though really equally false, and, moreover, mutually exclusive, are not, when taken separately, by any means so palpably absurd. Indeed, before they are closely analyzed, they can both be expressed in one general proposition: namely the proposition, not that under Socialism production would not be production for exchange; but that the proportion in which each class of products exchanged for others—or, in other words, the remuneration of each producer—would somehow or other be regulated on different principles. This proposition, however, when we come to analyze it closely, will be found to mean one or the other, and sometimes both, of the following contradictory things. It will be found to mean either (*a*) that, as regards the individual producer, *the true exchange-value of his products will be estimated according to a new and truer standard;* so that each man, whatever commodities he produces, will receive a full equivalent for them; or else (*b*) it may mean that *what he receives will have no necessary connection with the amount of these commodities at all*, but will be apportioned to him, as the Socialists put it, "not according to his deeds, but according to his needs." [1]

The essential difference and antagonism between these two ideas or theories can be illustrated very simply. Let us take the case of two men, neither of whom smokes, but whose occupation is to roll cigars: and we will suppose that one man, who is very energetic, rolls a thousand cigars a day; the other, who is more indolent, six hundred. It is obvious that these men do not roll them for their own consumption. Directly or indirectly they will somehow be exchanged for something. The only question is, for how much shall

[1] This idea has been expressed more fully in the formula, "every man is to work according to his capacity and be remunerated according to his requirements": and in England of late the public has become very familiar with it, through the doctrine of "the living wage," preached during the great coal-strike.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they be exchanged. According to the first theory (*a*) the amount which each man receives will depend upon the number of the cigars that he rolls; according to the second theory (*b*) it will depend on the amount of food, clothing, and accommodation requisite to keep him in some preconceived state of comfort. We will consider these two theories in order.

The first theory—namely, that according to which the position of the laborer will be bettered by Socialism, because Socialism will secure for him the true exchange-value of what he produces—is the theory of Karl Marx; and, according to many Socialists, it contains the very *idée mère* of Socialism. Now this theory coincides up to a certain point with the doctrines of the ordinary economists, and assumes a certain part of the economic process of the present as something which is permanent and would endure under any system. Indeed, what Karl Marx considered to be his great discovery purports to be simply an analysis of something that is happening round us every day and always will happen. This can be explained simply thus. Let us take any kind of finished product and consider the price which the consumer pays for it. This price, according to Marx, naturally and necessarily represents its true value. Let us suppose, for instance, all the bread in a community to be made and sold by some single corporation of persons; all the coats made and sold by another; and all the coal produced and sold by a third. Each of those three products being necessary to life, each corporation would of necessity retain as much of its own product as was necessary for its own consumption. The question of the value, or exchange-value, of each product, affects only the portions of it that are exchanged, not consumed, by the producers. How many loaves shall the corporation of coat-makers receive for each coat supplied by them to the corporation of bread-makers? How many hundredweight of coal shall the corporation of bread-makers receive for each hundred loaves they supply to the providers of coal? According to Marx these questions are answered by the actual facts of life. If we regard the producers of commodities, not as individuals, but as corporations, which both produce them and supply them to the consumer, commodities do, on the whole, exchange at their true value; and this value is, according to him, determined by the amount of average labor, measured by time, which is required on the average to produce each commodity. Some men, no doubt, may be exceptionally apt and diligent, others exceptionally idle: but in spite of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this there is an average standard of efficiency which makes an hour of the labor of any one man in any industry practically equal to an hour of the labor of any other man: and thus every coat out of a thousand similar coats will be practically the embodiment of an equal number of labor-hours; and the same will hold good of each loaf and each hundredweight of coal also. Hence each of these three commodities can be expressed in terms of a common denominator, namely, the labor-hour; and, according to Marx, commodities will, must, and actually do exchange in proportion to the number of labor-hours embodied in them. If the various kinds of labor that go to make a coat, and place it in the hands of the wearer, amount to eighty hours, the coat-makers, as a corporation, will, must, and actually do receive as many loaves as are produced and brought to the consumer by eighty hours of ploughing, sowing, reaping, baking, transport, and so forth.

It may seem that, thus far, the theory of this terrible revolutionist is a justification of the existing system rather than an attack upon it. It assumes, however, a very different character when we consider the producers no longer as corporations, but as individuals. In each corporation, according to Marx, there exists, under the present system, a minority of individuals who practically rob the others. These men are the employers and the capitalists; and, according to Marx, the essence of their position is this: they are the monopolists of the means of production—raw materials, workshops, machinery, and so forth; and the others—the great majority—are unable to exercise their labor, or produce anything at all, except with the permission of this small possessing minority, which accordingly sells its permission at the highest price possible,—that is to say, by exacting from the majority all the values produced by them except such as are sufficient to exchange for the barest necessaries of subsistence. Suppose, for instance, the coats produced in a given time by a thousand men (including all who contribute to the result, from the sheep-shearer to the retail shop-keeper) to cost the consumer a thousand pounds in the aggregate, this thousand pounds would be the true value of the coats; and if all the producers worked the same number of hours, the amount due to each man would be properly one pound. Let us then suppose the labor-time contributed by each man to be two days, of eight labor-hours each, the amount properly due to each man would be ten shillings a day. But the arts of production being in their present advanced condition, while the absolute neces-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saries for keeping a man alive remain unchanged, each man produces more than three times the amount of these necessaries. He can be kept alive on three shillings, while he actually produces ten. Such being the case, the monopolists of the means of production are able to take—and do take—from each man the entire surplus over and above this three shillings. That is to say, out of each ten shillings they mulct or rob the producer of seven shillings as the price of allowing him to produce anything at all. The aim of Socialism, therefore, so far as the remuneration of labor is concerned, is essentially, according to Marx, neither more nor less than this: to expropriate the monopolists, to place the means of production practically in the hands of the producers, and thus to enable each of them to receive the entire value of his products, which, if we adhere to the foregoing suppositions, will be ten shillings instead of three.

Now with regard to the theory of Marx, taken as a whole, what I desire to show is that it contains virtually the three following distinct propositions, of which two are perfectly true, and of which one is false. (*a*) If we take Marx's theory that labor-time is the measure of value, and qualify it with certain arbitrary suppositions, or apply it to societies in their earliest, their crudest, and least civilized stages, we get a proposition that is undoubtedly true. (*b*) If we apply the same theory to society as it exists now, we get a proposition that is not only false, but false to a grotesque degree. (*c*) If, turning from that part of Marx's theory which relates to the measure of value, to the part which asserts that the remuneration of each producer is determined by the value (however measured) of his products, and that the amount of this value must always be measured, and is measured at the present moment, by certain laws (whatever these laws may be) which inhere in the structure of all society, then, and so far, the theory of Marx is true.

Let us take these three points, (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*) in the order in which they have just been given.

(*a*) Let us suppose a community of three men, all equally strong and working an equal number of hours, each of whom produces some one of three necessary commodities, such as bread, clothes, and fuel, and just manages to produce enough of each to satisfy the requirements of three men. It is evident that, as all the men work equally hard, each will demand the produce of a third of the labor-hours of the two others. Goods will perforce exchange exactly as Marx says they do. They will exchange in proportion to the number of labor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hours embodied in them. And what is true of a community of three such men as we imagined may be approximately true of any very rude societies whose requirements are limited to necessaries, and whose methods of production are very simple.

(*b*) But in what we call advanced or progressive societies, and emphatically in society as we know it now and as Marx criticised it, —a society in which the natural powers of labor are indefinitely and progressively increased by machinery and industrial organization,— the case is absolutely different, and for two distinct reasons. One reason is that in this increased production of commodities there is no longer involved one kind of exertion only,—namely, what Marx means by average labor,—but labor of various qualities and of various degrees of importance; and, more important still than these, those kinds of exertion by which labor is directed, whether they be those of the inventor or those of the industrial manager. The other reason is that as man's powers of production increase, they are used not mainly to multiply those few and simple commodities which are needed by all alike, and without which life is impossible; but rather to multiply the kinds of commodities produced,—not to multiply, for example, beyond a certain point, the number of loaves and boots and cheeses, but to supplement those necessaries by an indefinite number of superfluities, such as neckties, gloves, lace curtains, china ornaments, carpets, musical instruments, tobacco, books.

We will consider these two reasons separately.

The first criticism that will suggest itself to any ordinary student of Marx's theory of value as applied to existing circumstances is, that by making value a mere matter of average labor-hours, he entirely ignores the most obvious function of machinery and invention, to say nothing of industrial management. The answer which Marx and his school make to this obvious objection, though not wanting in ingenuity, will enable us to see at once the flaw in their whole position, and the curious nature of the mistake by which they have deceived and bewildered themselves. They maintain that machinery and invention (and indeed by parity of reasoning every rare talent that increases the volume of production) though they multiply the number of commodities (or as they call them "values in use"), have no effect whatever on the exchange-values produced in the same number of labor-hours. Mr. Hyndman, one of Marx's most vociferous disciples in England, has explained this doctrine for the benefit of the English working classes by the following simple illus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tration. He takes two common commodities, such as a pair of boots and a box,—both, as he says, useful things, and satisfying some social need,—and assumes that the one takes longer to make than the others. While one man, we will say, makes one pair of boots, another man, or either of the men, is able to make two boxes. Accordingly the value of two boxes is one pair of boots. Suppose, however, that box-making becomes so much easier that a man can make four boxes instead of two in the same space of time, he will have to give four boxes instead of two for one pair of boots. Thus, though the box-maker produces more values in use, the exchange-values which he produces remain what they were before. His four boxes, just like his two, have an exchange-value of one pair of boots only.

Now it is quite possible to imagine a state of things to which this reasoning would apply. The box-maker might accidentally discover that a wood which he had hitherto neglected was twice as easy to work as that which he had used hitherto; and if his products were doubled by a pure accident such as this, Mr. Hyndman's reasoning would be no doubt true. But if two such workers as he supposes represent any reality at all, they certainly do not represent the realities of any civilized community: and they fail to do so for the two following reasons. Firstly, production, as a fact, has not been increased by accident; but by the action of exceptional abilities which are a close natural monopoly. Secondly, Mr. Hyndman's illustration, if it represented anything at all, would represent a community in which one trade only was progressive; and such a community does not exist anywhere, nor is it worth our while to talk about it. In all progressive communities the progress is practically general. If the boot-maker, therefore, and the box-maker, are to illustrate the realities of civilization, we must imagine boot-making to become easier in the same proportion as box-making; and then we shall see that the position is completely changed. We shall see that the four boxes have an exchange-value not of one pair of boots, but two. Thus, though the exchange-value of each separate article would remain unchanged, the number of these articles, and their aggregate values in exchange, would increase in the precise ratio of the increase in each worker's productivity. And this is the only point that is worth attention. All that Marx and Mr. Hyndman can prove from their theory is, that the exchange-value of the individual article is not increased by its multiplication, whether through machinery or any other means; that is to say, individual articles do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not become dearer. But who ever maintained that they did? What man in his senses has not always maintained the precise contrary? If one pair of boots cost two boxes a hundred years ago, because the boxes and boots then each took a man a day to make them; and to-day, owing to machinery and invention, two pairs of boots and four boxes can be made in the same time,—the value of boots in terms of boxes, and the value of boxes in terms of boots will remain unchanged; but, labor-day for labor-day, each producer will be the producer of twice as many such values.

Now, supposing for a moment that, for each kind of commodity thus multiplied, the demand is still undiminished,—or, in other words, supposing demand to be a constant quantity,—and supposing also that at each stage of production, no matter how many or how few commodities are produced during the average labor-day, the average amount of Ability devoted to each trade remains unaltered, it is no doubt true that at each of these stages labor-time will remain the measure of value. But the astonishing thing about Marx and his disciples is, that they confuse the true proposition that labor-time, with certain strict reservations, is the measure of value, with the insane proposition that it is the cause of the multiplication of values,[1] and that consequently the gross value of the output of any factory, for instance, is altogether due to the labor of the operatives,

[1] Let us express the natural productivity of a craftsman in each trade by the number 1. We shall then get the values of the products in each trade, during a given time, by merely multiplying this number by the number of craftsmen who produce them. Thus, if there are fifty craftsmen producing each kind of commodity, a day's product in each trade will have an exchange-value of 50. But if in certain of these trades, or in all of them to unequal degrees, some few men of genius contrive, by directing the craftsmen, to increase the unit of production per man from 1 to 3 in one trade, from 1 to 7 in another, and from 1 to 8 in another, and if, on these men of genius ceasing thus to exert themselves, the productivity of labor should drop again to 1, the labor embodied in each set of commodities would still be an element in the value; but it would no longer be the sole or even the chief element. The chief element to consider would be the augmented unit of productivity. It would be impossible any longer to tell the relative value of boots and boxes merely by reference to the fact that fifty men had produced so many of each in a day. We should have to know also the exact degree to which the unit of productivity had been in each case raised by the man of genius; and the result of our calculation would depend not only on the fact that we had in each case to multiply something by 50; but on whether the something to be multiplied were 3, 7, 8, or any other number. As a matter of fact, among the various employers in each trade at any given time there is an average power of ability by which the power of labor is multiplied; but exceptional ability always secures profits or exchange-values greater, in proportion to the amount of labor employed by it, than are secured by inferior ability.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and not to the machinery by which it is assisted, and the intelligence by which it is economized and controlled.[1]

I need not, however, insist on this special point farther; for large numbers of thinkers among the Socialists themselves are beginning to admit the error of Marx in this particular; though naturally they are chary of showing, even if they themselves see, the error of their idol in all its true absurdity. I will therefore pass on to the second error of the great Socialist leader.

His first error, as we have just seen, consists in his imperfect analysis of the relations of machinery, and of supply generally, to value. His second error consists in his completely ignoring the effect of demand on value. And the source of his error in this second respect is precisely the same as in the first. It consists in his failure to realize the profound difference between a rude society, whose products were so few and so necessary that the demand for each was obviously a constant quantity, and the modern civilization which he was specially concerned to analyze. The vital difference, so far as demand is concerned, between an advancing civilization such as our own, and savagery, or civilization in its infancy, depends on the fact that whereas in a savage state all production is production of the primary necessaries of life, or the commodities for which the demand is constant, these commodities in a civilized state are produced by a fewer and ever fewer number of men; and the productive powers that are released from the production of necessaries are devoted to the production of superfluities. Economically, in short, civilization is a superstructure of superfluities raised on a foundation of necessaries, and progressively dwarfing in bulk, like all other rising structures, the foundation on which it rests. In other words, a community of a given size grows in material civilization, not in proportion to a decrease in the number of necessaries produced by it, but in proportion to the decrease in the number of the men required to produce them, and the consequent increase in the number of men who produce superfluities. Thus, in a civilized state, not only is the bulk of superfluities incomparably greater than the bulk of necessaries, but the number of men whose claim to a livelihood depends on the exchange-values embodied in superfluities is incomparably greater than the number of men whose similar

[1] According to the theory of Marx, machinery adds to the value of products only in so far as it is worn out in producing them, and thus incorporates in the products the previous labor-time of the persons who made it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

claims depend on the exchange-value embodied in necessaries. Thus the problem of value in a civilized community is almost entirely a question of the exchange-value of superfluities.

Now the main difference between the demand for bare necessaries and the demand for superfluities is that, while the first is practically fixed, the second is elastic and variable. Let us take instances. A certain amount of bread, or some equivalent food, is a daily necessary for every human being. Tobacco, wine, and theatrical entertainments are superfluities. Some men drink wine, and neither smoke nor care for the play; others do both of these last things but drink no wine at all; and the practice of men with regard to each varies at different times in their lives. At one time a man likes a cigar better than Burgundy; at another Burgundy better than a cigar; and at another he likes the play better than either; and his expenditure on these matters will vary according to his taste. To say this, however, is to state but half the truth. To the statement that his expenditure will vary according to his taste, we must add that it will vary according to the relations between the intensity of his taste —that is to say his desire for cigars, Burgundy, or the play,—and the sacrifice he will have to make in order to gratify this desire. Let us suppose a community of four men, each of whom, in their original condition, manages to produce just enough of one of four necessaries to enable them all to live. Here, as has been said already, the demand, like the supply, is a constant quantity, and, this being so, labor is the measure of value. But now let us suppose that the community has become civilized, and that one man, owing to improved methods, can produce all the necessaries, and that, of the other three, one produces wine, another cigars, while the third amuses the rest by performances of Punch and Judy. So long as all three others are amused by these performances of the fourth, they may be willing each to give him a fourth part of what they produce—say a loaf of bread, a bottle of Burgundy, and three cigars daily. But suppose that the three grew somewhat tired of his performances, and decided between themselves that for two days out of three they would sooner smoke these three cigars and drink this bottle of Burgundy themselves. The utmost the performer could do would be to refuse to perform unless he received for his performances their original exchange-value: and the others would answer every two days out of three, "We have no wish that you should do so." The performer, who, *ex hypothesi*, would think a cigar and a bottle of wine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every third day better than none at all, would inevitably have to accommodate himself to the terms offered by the others. In other words, the exchange-value of his performances would have fallen, not because they represented less labor, but because for this labor there was less demand.

And now for these four kinds of labor let us substitute an indefinite number; and for individuals performing each let us substitute groups of individuals; and we shall have before us civilized society as it is: but the essence of the situation as above described will be absolutely unchanged. In any civilized society, from the very fact of its being civilized, there will always be a demand for superfluities of some sort, and to an indefinite extent; but the demand for superfluities of any given kind is liable to constant variation. As a fact, any civilized public may be relied on to demand plays; but the demand for the individual plays offered to it varies indefinitely alike in intensity and in duration, and has no calculable relation to the amount of labor involved in their production. A still more luminous example is that of a book or a newspaper. The labor involved in setting the type will be the same whether one copy is sold or a million; but the exchange-value of an edition will differ, since whatever part may be unsold will be merely so much waste paper.

Now all this, so far as it relates to the existing system, is becoming gradually understood even by many Socialists; and the error committed by Marx in ignoring the operation of demand is becoming as plain to them as the error which vitiates his analysis of supply. But one and all of these theorists imagine that, in some unexplained way, the operation of demand would be changed if the dream of Marx were realized, and if the exchange-values that, in each industry, go at present to the manager, the inventor, and the capitalist, were taken by the state and made over to the manual laborers. The great point on which to insist is as follows,—and, as soon as it it is once understood, it becomes the merest truism,—that such a change, could it be accomplished even without any injury to the industries in question, would not alter the question of values in any way whatever.

Let us suppose that, at any given moment, the community as a whole pays for its cigars to the cigar-makers a million pounds annually; and that half a million of this goes to the employers and the capitalists. Were the dream of Marx realized, the same gross sum

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would still be paid; only this second half of it would be added to the wages of the operatives. That is to say, their wages would be doubled. But now let us suppose that, after this result is accomplished, opium-smoking comes into fashion, and the demand for cigars is so weakened that the public will continue to buy the same number only on condition that they are sold at a reduced price. The million pounds formerly expended will infallibly and necessarily shrink—let us say, for example's sake—to seven hundred and fifty thousand. That is to say the wages of the operatives are reduced by 25 per cent. So long as the employer takes a portion of the gross value, any reduction in that gross value may perhaps fall only upon him. Instead of wages being reduced by 25 per cent the profits of the employer may be reduced by 50. Thus the workmen are blinded to the real nature of the situation. So far as they are concerned, the employer acts as a buffer. But if once the Socialist could take the employer's profits and make them over to the manual laborers, the laborers would feel instantly, and with unmitigated severity, every decline in the demand for whatever commodity they might be producing.[1]

The more completely we eliminate, in imagination, the figure of the employer and capitalist from society, the more completely does the inevitable, the imperious bearing of demand on values, and consequently on the receipts of the laborers, show itself. Let us divide a community into as many groups of laborers as there are commodities or services demanded by the community as a whole at any given time. Let us say that there are ten groups, and ten kinds of commodities. Let us start with supposing that the amount of values which goes to each laborer is equal, because the demand for each commodity is in a certain given condition: and next let us take each commodity in succession, and suppose that the desire for it on the

[1] During the last great coal-strike in England the ridiculous doctrine was taught that wages could be made to rule prices, instead of prices ruling wages. Were all, or even most of the coal-consumption in England, consumption for absolute necessity, were it an irreducible minimum, and were all coal-production a monopoly in the hands of English workmen,—this would have been true in this case. But more than half the coal-consumption in the country is, directly or indirectly, consumption for superfluities; and these the public will have either at its own price or not at all. Further, with regard to monopolies, it is amusing to observe that while no men have more loudly denounced landlords and coal-owners as monopolists than the trade-union leaders, yet their main object during the great coal-strike was to place the colliers in the very position they denounced—*i.e.* of monopolists, not indeed of the mines themselves, but of the right to work in them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of the producers of the other nine commodities decreases. This means that the producers of these other nine commodities, who have hitherto been giving a tenth part of them to the producers of the tenth, would prefer either to consume a half of this tenth part themselves, or else to remain idle during the time required for its production, rather than give it, as hitherto, to the producers of the tenth commodity. Now it is evident that in such a case this tenth group of producers would find that their wages or receipts had fallen by exactly one-half; but if they resented this calamity, what remedy would be open to them? Could they strike? A leader of strikes in a socialistic state would indeed see strikes with eyes from which scales had fallen. He would see that a strike among such a group of workers as we have supposed would be one-tenth of the laborers striking against nine-tenths; and endeavoring to extract from them by force commodities which they desired to retain. From the point of view of nine-tenths of the community such a strike would be simply an attempt at robbery. The fact that the tenth group offered something in exchange for what it demanded would not alter this fact. This group, from the point of view of the other groups, would be attempting to get a pound in exchange for every ten shillings, which is merely a disguised form of stealing ten shillings. It is easy to see that in such a case force would be useless: and the mere refusal of the strikers to supply their commodity except on such terms as would yield them what they considered "a living wage" is a weapon that would be broken by the reply of all the other laborers, which would be, "Then in that case we do not want your commodity at all." In short we have only to follow the invitation of the Socialists so far as to imagine a state in which the laborers received everything, to realize that any attempt to make wages, instead of demand, regulate prices, would, on the part of whatever group of laborers might be concerned in it, be an attack on the interests of every other laborer in the community.

Socialists, and others besides Socialists, have failed to grasp this point, because in the socialistic state, as at present conceived of by its advocates, the exchange of commodities would not be a direct transaction, but would be accomplished by the state as an intermediary: and it is supposed that, as the state would in the first case receive all the commodities, and then superintend their distribution, any conflict of interests between the various groups of workers would be avoided. But the state, though it might disguise for a time the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nature of such a conflict, could alter the situation in one way only, and that is by tampering with values,—by robbing nine-tenths of the community for the benefit of one-tenth. Let us suppose that the general taste for theatrical performances declines; and that the theatres, which once were filled, are only half full now; and that the gross receipts (which we will suppose take the form of the Socialist's favorite labor-checks, and which will form the total divisible among the actors) yield them only half of what they consider a "living wage." The situation could be altered only by the actors being paid a living wage by the state, and the performances being made free. But the sum required for the adequate remuneration of the actors would have to be extracted from the remainder of the public through taxation. Of some of the commodities which they had themselves produced, and which they prefer either to consume or not to be at the trouble of producing, the majority would be forcibly mulcted, in order to support men who gave them no adequate equivalent. The only difference would be that the immediate object of their hostility would not be actors, but the state; and as the state under Socialism would theoretically respond to the will of the majority, it is evident that very soon the claims of the actors would be disallowed.

One thing only could prevent this,—and that would be the development of an unselfishness so great that it would entirely overbear all personal interests. Whether human nature as a whole is ever likely to exhibit such a development, need not be discussed here. All that I am here attempting to point out is, that so far as the interests of individuals are concerned, as embodied in demand and supply, there would be the same conflict between them under Socialism that there is at the present moment; and that so long as the majority of human beings were motived by these interests, so long as they were pleased when their interests were subserved, and irritated when their interests were thwarted, those conflicts of interest which now show themselves in the form of strikes would be changed by Socialism only by being given a different form, and being changed from an attack on the capitalists, which has something of the character of a rebellion, into an attack upon all laborers other than the aggrieved section, which would partake of the character—infinitely more cruel and bitter—of a civil war.

We thus come to the third point (*c*), with regard to which, as I have said, the theory of Marx is true. The great claim of Marx to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be considered a man of practical sagacity lies in the fact that he realized that all exchange, and all remuneration of the producers, does depend on the interest of the consumer,—does depend, that is to say, *on the commodities which the producer offers*, and not on what, as a private man, the producer happens to want. In so far as the theory of Marx rests on his analysis of exchange-value, faulty as that analysis is, it is a tribute to the great truth that we can understand what society will be, only by analyzing these great underlying facts, which make it what it is: and we have only to correct the errors which his analysis of values contains, to see that, were the socialistic system, as he conceived it, established, and did every laborer get what Marx thought was the full value of his products, not one of the elements of existing social discord would be abolished or even modified. We shall see in fact that so far are the effects of supply and demand from having been overstated by the orthodox economists, or from being transitory in their operation, that they would operate in a socialistic state even more rigidly, more unpityingly, and more openly than they do now; supposing only that the socialistic state be a civilized state,—not a collection of mere savages laboriously producing bare necessaries, but a community of men with multitudes of tastes, wants, imaginations, and aspirations, and the means of approximately satisfying them. We shall see, by considering such an imaginary state, that Demand and Supply are merely the two economic sides of all civilization whatsoever; that Demand is merely the economic side of man's mental civilization; and that Supply is merely the economic aspect of the means which he has devised for ministering to it.

W. H. Mallock.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RESUSCITATION OF BLUE LAWS.

THE municipal authorities of New York city have recently begun the systematic enforcement of a law requiring saloons to be closed on Sunday. Public opinion being greatly exercised, I propose to discuss the social and political aspects of the liquor question from the standpoint of a man who drinks with moderation whenever he is so disposed, and who would like everybody else to enjoy the like privilege.

The population of large cities consists of elements whose tastes and education differ with their nationality and religious beliefs; their inclinations respecting the observance of a holiday vary accordingly. Their principal guide, however, must be necessity. The wealthy and middle classes can enjoy life according to their desires,—they may devote Sundays or any other days to rest and religion; but to persons who work for a livelihood, the first day of the week alone offers opportunity for that recreation which is so essential to continued health of mind and body. These toilers constitute a large majority of our populace; to their industry we owe many of the comforts of life, and their wishes deserve our serious consideration. A ruthless interference with the enjoyment of the short hours of their leisure, therefore, is neither charitable nor wise.

England has a reputation for well-regulated Sundays. There the mechanic can find in the outskirts of every town, a good inn whose license compels the keeper to serve his customers after church hours. On bright Sundays I have seen Hampton Court, Richmond, and Kew filled with crowds of men, women, and children who behaved fully as well as our "four hundred" do at Delmonico's. Similar scenes present themselves on every holiday at the Bois de Boulogne in Paris, the Thiergarten in Berlin, and the Prater in Vienna: music adds charm to good cheer on the Continent. In all these places the sale of liquor is prohibited during the time reserved for worship.

Our Sunday laws originated with the Puritans of New England, who observed it like the orthodox Jews; but in their religious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zeal they went farther than the laws of Moses warrant. Doctor Johann David Michaelis, a celebrated expounder of the Mosaic laws, says "the day was set apart in order to combine recreation with rest and devotion." He translates Exodus xxiii. 12: "object of the Sabbath is to give rest to ox and ass, refreshment to servant and stranger." A strict observance was not countenanced by Jesus; for, according to St. Mark (ii. 27), "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." In speaking on this subject Dr. Martin Luther says, "Let us eat, drink, and be merry." The perverted minds of exalted ascetics would fain turn a day which had been chiefly intended for rest and pleasure into one of fasting and prayer. Such narrow-minded individuals sit in judgment over their neighbors and disregard St. Paul's lesson (Colossians, ii. 16): "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, *or in drink*, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, *or of the Sabbath days.*"

No form of religion being recognized by our constitutions, the cause of temperance has been the ostensible object of Sunday and other prohibitory laws. Wine belongs to the class of drinks the sale of which is restricted because, with the rest of alcoholic beverages, Prohibitionists consider it deleterious, although its praise has been sung in a thousand melodies since Anacreon's time. In writing of its effect, Jonathan Pereira, an English medical authority, says: "Wine used in moderate quantity is an almost indispensable stimulant. It quickens the action of the heart, augments the muscular force, and excites the mental powers." I can speak from experience; for, although I have used wine daily for thirty-five years, my faculties have never been impaired, nor have I ever been ill. When I travel in this country, the pleasure with which I take claret with my dinner has often been an object of curiosity. The few persons who partake of their food with ease, drinking and conversing alternately, will soon be recognized in our country hotels as Americans who have been abroad, or as foreigners. The average American hurriedly consumes the contents of numerous dishes in silence, assisted only by draughts of cold water and hot coffee. More frequently he looks rather as if he were doing penance than taking refreshment; for when he arises his face wears an expression of sorrow, as if he had been murdering his stomach. The historian Gervinus says:

"Wine sharpens the sting of wit, stimulates spirited conversation, and brightens the atmosphere. Whoever has any cause to turn away from the real world, and longs for the freedom of living in an ideal one, is fond of wine."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I attribute the prevalence of dyspepsia, our national disease, to the haste with which Americans generally take their meals without any stimulant other than a desire to return as quickly as possible to the routine of daily life. Elsewhere an hour or two is agreeably spent in discourse while the chief meal of the day is partaken of, in families as well as in hotels. At the *table d'hôte* of a Continental hotel you will always find congenial spirits among your neighbors, whose chat enlivens the meal, while enjoying a glass of home-made wine,—"Vin ordinaire" in France, "Mosel" in Germany, "Vöslauer" in Austria, and "Chianti" in Italy. Thus to drink is an intellectual as well as a physical pleasure.

The alcoholic strength of table wines is about 10 per cent.[1] Beer is much weaker, the percentage of alcohol in several good brands being as follows:

	Percentage of Alcohol
München Spatenbräu, Bock	5.23
" Salvator	4.49
Kulmbacher, dark	5.29
" light	4.47
Pilsener export	3.39
London Porter (Barclay & Perkins)	6.90
Scotch Ale	8.50

The average strength of our own lager beer is about 4 per cent. Doctor de Vaucleroy, a delegate from Brussels to the International Temperance Congress at Zurich, says of fermented liquors whose alcoholic properties are small, that "they may be consumed in moderate quantities without evil effect; they possess a nutritive value, and are considered a necessary auxiliary of social life." Beer has been called "the liquid bread of the poor." When enemies joined

[1] The following list gives the alcoholic strength of some of the wines commonly used in the United States:

	Percentage of Alcohol
Port and Madeira	20 to 23 per cent
Sherry and Marsala	12 to 20 " "
French white wines:	
Sauterne	15 " "
Champagne	10 to 12 " "
French red wines:	
Burgundy	15 " "
Margaux and St. Estèphe	10 " "
Lafite	8 to 9 " "
German white wines:	
Rudesheimer and Geisenheimer	12 " "
Hochheimer and Foster Riesling	10 " "
Zeltinger and other light Mosel	7 to 8 " "

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and drank it, it was a sign of reconciliation, while casual acquaintance ripened into friendship after drinking "Brüderschaft" in the foaming mug.

The man who buys his beer on Saturday to provide against Sunday thirst must procure it in bottles; which is neither so wholesome nor so palatable as when drawn fresh from the barrel. By compelling one, whose usual consumption is only an occasional glass, to buy a bottle of whiskey our Sunday laws encourage him to become intemperate and to render others so. With a flask by his side in the solitude of his rooms he will drink more than is good for him, or at least more than he would take in a public place. Our prohibitory laws have generally had such results; and drunkenness is comparatively more prevalent in the Prohibition States than elsewhere. John Parker Hale said that "there were never so many places where liquor is openly sold as under the operation of our prohibitory laws in New Hampshire." I drank more than usual when I happened to be in Boston while liquor was for a short time prohibited in Massachusetts; every friend I called upon invited me to drink at his "club." I soon found that saloons had been turned into private clubs to which customers had latch-keys. When I spent a night with a friend in Brookline, I found on the shelves of his library rows of sham books, under the covers of which bottles of rye and bourbon were hidden instead of the verses of Homer and Virgil. Means will be found in New York to evade our ridiculous Sunday law: forbidden fruit always tastes sweetest. I understand that Sunday clubs for poor men have already been organized in this city.

We consider Liberty and Equality our greatest privileges; but men are not equal who may on the same day become "as drunk as lords" at the Golden Gate and in the Rue Royale of New Orleans, gambling away their fortunes with impunity, while they would be arrested as criminals if they were to partake of a bottle of claret with their meals in Bangor, Maine. The statutes which forbid drinking on Sunday apply to different parts of this and other States, but are enforced only in New York city. The Constitution says that the privileges of citizens shall not be abridged; but the local enforcement of the Sunday law does abridge the privileges of the venders of beer and liquor, because it drives their customers from the city to other places, where they may drink without fear of molestation. This is an encroachment on the personal rights of these citizens. The in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equality between men who can afford the luxuries and privileges of club-life, and those who cannot, is more glaring still.

This liquor law was passed by Republicans in 1857, before the use of lager beer had become general; it was reënacted by Democrats in 1892 for the purpose, as some Republicans claim, of strengthening the corrupt power of Tammany Hall. Several legislators then shamelessly admitted that they voted for the measure only in the expectation that it would *never* be enforced. It is not immoral to drink; nor is the sale of liquor on Sunday, unless carried on so openly as to cause public scandal, of itself an evil. Drinks have usually been furnished to orderly persons who wanted to satisfy an innocent natural craving. In stopping this sale the ostensible object of the Police Commissioners was to hinder policemen from levying blackmail on the venders. I am constrained to think that a part of the hue and cry raised against this practice must be an exaggeration; and it is certain tha patrolmen would not have made a practice of interfering with the human, if not legal rights of saloonkeepers, if their superiors had not encouraged them to do so. As the cure is often more fatal than the disease, so may the means now being taken to abate this nuisance degenerate the morals of the police more than the nuisance itself did. The police force was created to prevent crime, not to instigate it. Mr. Roosevelt has revived a system of espionage which his predecessors had discontinued; he permits policemen and volunteer detectives in disguise to enter side doors of saloons on Sunday, to persuade their keepers to furnish drink, and then to arrest them. If it be the duty of Mayor Strong to cause such action to be taken, it must have been the duty of his predecessors for nearly forty years past,—including such men as Opdyke, Gunther, Havemeyer, and Grace. The only Reform mayor who made an attempt to enforce the odious law was Abram S. Hewitt, and he gave it up in despair after the trial of a few weeks. In Brooklyn Mr. Seth Low refused to interfere; the cautious Republican Mayor Schieren takes no action.

The success of the Reform movement was largely due to German voters; and as they were given to understand that their Sunday recreation would not be interfered with they are now naturally irritated. They realize the difficulty of getting this law repealed, although it is unequal and has been used as an instrument for blackmail in the past. Temperance men from the rural districts and cities, who form a large majority among the Assemblymen at Albany, are not likely to listen to reasonable argument. While Germans are loyal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

citizens, and will obey the law to the letter so long as it remains on the statute-books, they will probably inaugurate a campaign of education to convince the community that even the poor man who drinks beer on Sunday may be a respectable member of society. I think that a good substitute for present legislation would be local option for large cities, a majority deciding for each municipality how the liquor traffic should be regulated.

I advocate the creation of a responsible Excise Board with ample power, consisting of merchants, chemists, physicians, and lawyers of high standing; their duties to be:

1. To adjust the amounts to be paid for licenses, and to decide to whom and on what terms they ought to be issued. Only a reasonable charge, not over $50 per annum, should be made for the privilege of selling fermented liquors, inclusive of wine, containing less than 14 per cent of alcohol;[1] such license to be granted to every reliable applicant. Ardent spirits animate the blood; when taken in moderation they act like medicine; they become poisonous when taken to excess. A thousand dollars a year may be a proper charge for the privilege of selling distilled liquors in New York: this amount was advocated by Howard Crosby. Whatever charge be made, the privilege ought to be granted only to men of good morals; they should be placed under bonds, and made responsible for the orderly conduct of their customers and the lawful behavior of their employees. The license of any establishment furnishing ardent liquor to a minor or other irresponsible person should be revoked.

2. To make, from time to time, a chemical analysis of liquors sold to the public. According to the English and Bavarian laws, beer must consist solely of barley-malt and hops: here drugs are

[1] I quote from the Tenth Annual Report (1879) of the Health Board of Massachusetts: "Light German beer is used more each year, to the exclusion of stronger liquors,—a change which should be hastened by legislative encouragement of the sale of mild liquors."

The production and consumption of beer in 1890 was:

	Total Annual Consumption	Proportion for Each Inhabitant
1. Belgium	about 290,592,500 gallons.	46.76 gallons.
2. Great Britain	" 1,373,710,000 "	39.98 "
3. Germany	" 1,400,127,500 "	27.94 "
4. Denmark	" 59,439,375 "	27.18 "
5. United States	" 977,447,500 "	15.32 "
6. Switzerland	" 26,417,500 "	10.57 "
7. Netherlands	" 39,626,250 "	8.98 "
8. France	" 224,548,750 "	5.81 "

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

used in the preparation of lager beer, some as substitutes for hops, others in order to ripen it prematurely, a process which sometimes takes only as many weeks as it does months in Bavaria. There are wines in the market which do not contain a vestige of grape-juice. Among the adulterations of whiskey is coloring to give it the appearance of age. Whenever adulterated liquor is discovered, the entire stock should be spilled in the public highway (as is done in Bavaria), and the license of the dealer in whose possession it is found should be revoked forever. We should probably then have wholesome beer and wine without importing it from England, France, and Germany, and could procure a drink of whiskey without fear of being poisoned. I do not apprehend that such laws would be found unconstitutional.

When a drunken man becomes offensive or disorderly, he ought to be punished; but aside from such wholesome restriction I favor the free sale of liquor at all times except during the hours of service on Sundays; and I see no reason why the liberty of one person should be restrained because another person cannot control himself.

LOUIS WINDMÜLLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POLITICAL LEADERS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD.

THERE were men of great and varied ability among the political leaders of the Reconstruction period, in the events of which, as a Federal Senator, it fell to my lot to play a part; but looking back upon it now, when the lapse of nearly thirty years has made possible a calm, dispassionate survey of the men and measures of that era, I am more than ever persuaded that it was a heavy, almost fatal misfortune that the Republican party, then dominant in every branch of the Government, was wholly unfitted as a political organization for the work in hand. The reason for this is plain now if it was not then. Brought into being in 1856 for the avowed and practically sole purpose of destroying the institution of slavery, and engaged until the close of the war in attaining that end, the party had been born and bred to the work of destruction. But the work of rebuilding fallen States and reorganizing social and economic conditions had now come, and a Congress elected on the issues of the war and elated by recent victory, in no sense equipped for so great and delicate a task, was forced to undertake the restoration of a fallen civilization.

Amid the confusion of the proposed schemes for reconstruction, Abraham Lincoln was perhaps the one man who saw clearly what was most needed and the best means of securing it. As the end of the struggle came in view his mind instinctively turned to the question he saw must soon arise as to how the revolted States were to be restored to their proper relations to the Union. Mr. Lincoln had no sympathy with the doctrine that the States of the South had committed suicide and were dead, clearing the ground for the erection of such political structures as the victors might determine upon, but held rather that they were dormant, awaiting the authority of the General Government to set them again in motion on lines consistent with the new order of things, including the abolition of slavery. On this basis he projected a scheme of reorganization by the appointment of provisional governors and other necessary officials, and providing for their immediate resumption of the Federal positions in the several

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States that had become vacant by force of the rebellion. This was a very natural process of reconstruction. It was as far as Mr. Lincoln then proposed to go. It was only a beginning, but it reëstablished government in those States, demonstrated that they were still members of the Union, and proved that as American citizens the people of the Southern States were as much citizens of the United States as ever they were, and that as such it was the duty of the Federal Government to protect them in all their rights. So, as one of the leaders of the Reconstruction period, Mr. Lincoln stands vastly above and far in advance of all the others who took up the work after him.

Andrew Johnson, however, while indorsing and accepting the Lincoln plan of reconstruction, lacked his predecessor's fine sagacity and unequalled ability to mould and direct public opinion, and, unprepared as he was for his sudden and unlooked-for elevation to the Presidency, it is not a matter for surprise that he failed to satisfy public expectation, or that he has passed into history as the most generally and perversely hated man by his political opponents that ever sat in the Presidential chair. The people expected impossibilities from Mr. Johnson, as they would have expected from any other successor of Mr. Lincoln, and, of course, they were disappointed. The jealousies that even before Mr. Lincoln's death had begun to crop out in the chance utterances of public men found expression in critical and unsought advice to Mr. Johnson as to the policies he should pursue. But to all he answered plainly that he proposed to carry out Mr. Lincoln's plans of administration and restoration; and the more firmly he adhered to that purpose, the more open and vicious became the assaults of his accusers. Following this, a hostile Congress sought to hamper him on every side and in every conceivable way. Had he possessed Mr. Lincoln's rare tact in such controversies, and rarer ability to bend the wills of strong men to act in unison with his own, and to enlist the masses of the people in his support despite the opposition of their local leaders, the results would perhaps have been different. But, lacking these qualities, the odds were against the President, and the struggle went on until it culminated in the futile effort to remove him from office. Despite his often brusque exterior Mr. Johnson was at heart just and considerate, a sincere lover of his country, and a true and pure patriot.

Edwin M. Stanton, who was Secretary of War during a large part of the Lincoln and Johnson administrations, and who began as Johnson's friend, but soon became one of his bitterest enemies,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was in many respects a most extraordinary man. His was a contradictory and often puzzling personality, and one to which it is difficult to do justice, for he was seldom just to himself. Gifted with marked administrative ability, his conduct of his great office was marked by wonderful energy, and he was often of great and inestimable service to the country. On the other hand, his official career was marred by unreasoning personal hatreds and grievous personal injustices, and Mr. Lincoln was often compelled to countermand his orders, to prevent private injury and public wrong. He had supreme confidence in himself, and little or none in any other than himself; but it is to be said in his behalf that there was nothing venal about him, and that fact places a long mark to his credit, serving as he did at a time when venality was rampant in public places.

In the early 'forties I had been an ardent admirer of Salmon P. Chase, then coming into prominence in Ohio as a champion of the anti-slavery cause, and when I came to know him in Washington thirty years later my early admiration ripened into profound respect. Mr. Chase was a politician of a high type in the best sense of that much-abused term; a man of distinctive and superior personality and of rare natural dignity; possessed of a fine and delicate consideration for others, broad, liberal, and just in his views of public affairs; and intuitively correct in his estimates of public men. His personal appearance was most impressive. Mr. Chase was Mr. Lincoln's first Secretary of the Treasury, and to him the country was indebted for the financial system that carried it successfully through the war. Later, as Chief Justice, presiding in the Senate on the trial of Mr. Johnson, he was the ideal of a just and impartial judge, and his part therein was one of the most honorable passages in an illustrious career.

Benjamin F. Wade, of Ohio, who was President *pro tem.* of the Senate when I entered that body in 1866, was long a unique and striking figure in American politics. Entering the Senate at the height of the anti-slavery struggle, late in the 'fifties, his lack of education was more than compensated by his force of character and native resources; and these, coupled with his bold and always aggressive discussion of the great topics then uppermost in the public mind, soon gave him high rank with his party associates. Events, however, proved him a poor commander. As presiding officer of the Senate he was not a success, and the fact that he permitted himself to be forced to vote for the deposition of Mr. Johnson under conditions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that made him that gentleman's successor as President, was a blemish on his career that can never be effaced. But the glitter of the bauble had for the moment turned his head. Later, his failure to secure the coveted prize of the Presidency seemed to have soured his naturally genial, buoyant temperament, and those who had previously enjoyed his friendship came to be regarded by him as his personal enemies. In the end, however, he became reconciled, and just before his death I received the verbal message from him, "Tell Ross it was all right," —referring, of course, to my vote against impeachment, and his consequent exclusion from the Presidency. In March, 1869, Mr. Wade was succeeded in the Senate by Allan G. Thurman, who at once took high rank in the Senate. Though handicapped by an overwhelming Republican majority against him, no man in the Senate had more completely the unquestioning confidence of all in his honor and fidelity to his convictions. To his followers the historic red bandanna was a gonfalon, and, to his opponents, in turn a flag of truce or of defiance.

John Sherman was the other Senator from Ohio during the Reconstruction period. He had entered Congress as a Free-Soiler in 1852, and at the time of which I write had developed into an active, forceful, and very influential Republican leader. The most remarkable feature of Mr. Sherman's long public career has been his singular ability successfully to champion at different times opposite sides of important questions, and yet retain his influence in the councils of his party. His attitude on the impeachment was a memorable case in point. It was he who first developed the weakness of the case against the President by demonstrating that Stanton's dismissal from the office of Secretary of War was not an infraction of the Tenure-of-Office Act, and therefore not an impeachable offence, since Mr. Stanton, as Mr. Lincoln's and not Mr. Johnson's appointee, was not protected by that act. However, Mr. Sherman preserved his hold upon his party by declaring his purpose of voting for the President's impeachment on the second and third articles, which were based on the first and had no force save in connection therewith. His pro-impeachment colleagues were satisfied with this seeming and tardy repentance; but from the moment he avowed his opposition to the first article, the impeachment enterprise was doomed, and Mr. Sherman is too shrewd a man not to have known it. Many doubted whether Mr. Sherman was in reality an honest supporter of the impeachment movement, and his course in this regard affords some grounds for that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doubt, but it is a fair illustration of his ability to trim his sails to every varying breeze. Cool, calculating, and austere, Mr. Sherman has been able to retain his hold upon public life continuously for more than forty years,—a record almost without a parallel in our history.

Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, was in some respects the most conspicuous figure in the Senate during the Reconstruction period. A man of ripe scholarship and extreme polish, of commanding physique and stately pose, and skilled in all the arts of the orator, his assumption of the floor in debate was, as a rule, a promise of an hour's intellectual feast. During his long service in that body he had come—perhaps unconsciously—to regard himself as the intellectual premier of the Senate, and to consider it a personal indignity for a younger member to criticise his acts or dispute the correctness of his conclusions. This peculiarity early led to an unpleasantness between Mr. Sumner and myself which continued until after my retirement from the Senate. Afterwards, however, he was great enough to see, and generous enough to acknowledge, that he had made a mistake. His course in the impeachment trial, in marked contrast to that of the majority of his party associates, showed a desire to deal fairly with the President, he voting to hear all that was offered in his behalf, though also declaring for his conviction and removal at its close.

Henry Wilson, Mr. Sumner's colleague, was a broad-brained, large-hearted man who cared little for the petty and merely partisan considerations which governed so many of his associates in the impeachment trial, and his subsequent declarations showed that he deeply regretted many things that marked and marred the proceedings of the Senate in that affair. A kindly, genial man, thoroughly self-poised and independent, he was a typical American Senator of the highest type. The Republic has had few better servants than Henry Wilson.

The same is true of William Pitt Fessenden, of Maine, who entered the Senate before the war and quickly took high rank for his ability, splendid fitness for his new duties, and thorough comprehension of the questions upon which he was called to act. He was long the chairman of the Reconstruction Committee, and, in a very complete sense, a leader of the Senate in that great and critical work. In the Senate caucus on the impeachment question he delivered a strong argument against the conviction of the President, and every effort was made to induce him to change his position, but in vain. Though a political opponent of Mr. Johnson's, the logical conclusions he had reached outweighed all considerations personal to himself, and his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was the first Republican vote against conviction. A sensitive and not physically vigorous man, the intense hostility of his Republican associates, engendered by this act, affected him most keenly, and, it is not too much to say, drove him, a few months later, to his grave. In his death the country lost one of its greatest, bravest, and truest men.

When I entered the Senate, Reverdy Johnson, of Maryland, was its oldest member both in age and length of service, and no man in that body stood higher in the affectionate regard of his colleagues of both parties. I shall never forget the kindly consideration shown by him to younger members whenever they approached him for information relating to any topic of legislation under discussion. He appreciated the fact that his career in the Senate was about to end, and his constant desire seemed to be to close it with the pleasing consciousness that he had knowingly omitted no proper opportunity to impart to others a measure of the vast and valuable knowledge of public affairs with which his great brain was stored.

At the opening of the Reconstruction period Lyman Trumbull, of Illinois, had been for many years an honored leader in the Senate, enjoying the confidence of his party and the respect of his political opponents. His age and experience, but more especially his matured and discriminating judgment, gave great weight to his opinions and purposes. He was the compeer of Lincoln and Douglas, and had shared with them many of the political campaigns that had given renown to his State. Personally of a gentle and affable nature, the younger members of the Senate at all times and on all questions found Mr. Trumbull an ever willing and safe adviser. But he disagreed with his party on the impeachment scheme, and all his years of splendid service to his country in its most critical hours went for naught.

No State was more ably represented in the Senate during the Reconstruction period than was Indiana by Oliver P. Morton and Thomas A. Hendricks. Mr. Morton, from the date of his entry into the Senate in 1867, took high rank in the leadership of his party. Unlike most of his partisans he showed generous tolerance of the differences of opinion and judgment which led a portion of his Republican colleagues to oppose the conviction of Mr. Johnson, and a courageous disregard for the dictum of banishment from the party councils which the majority had entered up against these dissenting members. On more than one occasion he rendered the latter valuable aid in the procurement of needed legislation for their States. It was a public misfortune that Mr. Morton's physical disabilities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made impossible on his part a longer participation in public affairs; but while he remained in the Senate he was seldom absent from his seat, and as rarely failed to take an active and beneficial interest in the disposal of the business of legislation. Mr. Hendricks, his colleague, was then the undisputed leader of the Democratic party in the Senate. Able, shrewd, and tactful, a good parliamentarian, and with few equals in running debate, Mr. Hendricks commanded the respect, and in a signal degree the confidence, of the entire Senate.

James W. Grimes, then the senior Senator from Iowa, was eminently a product of American conditions and life. Emigrating to Iowa while yet a young man, he became by turns stage-driver, hotel-keeper, merchant, and politician, till middle age found him a Senator of the United States. Added to exceptional native ability, the vicissitudes of Western life, and an education secured by close application to his books after the laborious occupations of the day, gave him a strenuous but fitting equipment for the discharge of public duty, and when I entered the Senate he had come to be regarded as one of the wisest and most trusted leaders of his party. At the conclusion of the impeachment trial Mr. Grimes was a marked figure. A few days before he had been stricken with a fatal illness, and as he arose to his feet on that fateful day, supported by friends on either side, the scene became at once pathetic and heroic. In his then physical condition, and in view of the personal and political enmities his vote would provoke, it was apparent that he was about to perform the last important public act of his life. But, though enfeebled by the illness that was upon him, he gave no signs of hesitancy or weakness, and his vote was "not guilty." He died shortly after, and no man ever departed from the Senate leaving behind more sincere friends or more ardent admirers for his courage and his manly, companionable qualities. James Harlan, the colleague of Mr. Grimes, was a unique figure in the Senate. In earlier days a frontier Methodist preacher, he had much of the habit of that fraternity in his style of address and method of argument. Yet, of large frame and powerful physique, he was forceful and at times singularly impressive in language and manner, and by no means without influence in giving direction to the decisions of the Senate. Mr. Harlan represented the then controlling ideas and characteristics of his State, but belonged to a class of frontier politicians that is now practically extinct.

Zachariah Chandler, the senior Senator from Michigan, was in many respects a typical Westerner. Entering the Senate at the open-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing of the war, his native tact, personal force, and extreme radicalism, soon made him a prominent and influential figure. During the impeachment trial he was one of the most relentless and vicious of Mr. Johnson's persecutors, and had no patience and little association with those of less radical views. Huge-framed and loud-voiced, his noisy oratory was impressive, but not convincing; and it was quite as impossible for him to convert his hearers to his own ways of thinking as it was for others to impress him with the correctness of views contrary to his own. He was an obtrusive figure of a type that has passed, with slight cause for regret, and probably forever, from the Senatorial stage. Jacob M. Howard, the other Senator from Michigan, offered a sharp contrast to his colleague. They were alike bitter partisans and unrelenting in their hostility to the President, but there the resemblance ended. Mr. Howard was a man of ability and culture, had had a distinguished career at the bar, and proved an industrious and useful Senator. Though intensely radical in his political convictions he was capable of doing justice to an opponent, and this was a quality not possessed by Mr. Chandler.

James R. Doolittle, of Wisconsin, was an influential factor in the work of the Senate during the Reconstruction period. From its formation and until the close of the war he was a conspicuous leader in the Republican party and contributed in generous measure to its great work for the preservation of the Union. Justly regardful of the rights of all, when the armies of the rebellion laid down their arms he believed the war at an end, and that the time had arrived for the assertion of the doctrines of peace and of a united nationality. For this he was driven from the Senate, but no man ever held a seat in that body who was more thoroughly imbued with a sense of public or private justice, or animated with a firmer purpose to fill it acceptably and to the greatest good of his country. His colleague, Timothy O. Howe, was a wiry, active, and more or less influential participant in the legislation of the period. He had many excellent qualities and was a man of more than average ability. He was one of the two Republican Senators who contributed so effectually to the defeat of the Johnson impeachment by announcing in the Senatorial conference that he could not vote to sustain the first article of the indictment, which set out the head and front, the basic facts, of the President's offending. To offset this defection, however, and apparently to save himself from ostracism by his party, Mr. Howe was all the more pronounced and eager for conviction on certain other articles.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Edgar Cowan, of Pennsylvania, left the Senate soon after I entered that body. A wise counsellor and a true friend, Mr. Cowan's sturdy independence, which would not permit him to work easily in party grooves, no less than his vigorous and well-trained intellect, made him a power in the Senate at a time when men of his stamp were most needed there. It would be difficult to imagine two men more dissimilar than Mr. Cowan and Simon Cameron,—who succeeded him in 1867. Possessed of the proverbial thrift and shrewdness of his Scotch ancestors, and never over-scrupulous in aims or methods, Mr. Cameron was of that class of men who never forgive an injury, real or fancied, and never forget a favor. Though a man of companionable instincts and generous impulses, his public career was not a success in the correct purview of that term. Like Mr. Cowan, Charles R. Buckalew, the other Senator from Pennsylvania, was the reverse of Mr. Cameron in almost very particular. An educated and scholarly man, Mr. Buckalew, in his association with his fellow members, was always courteous, respectful, and considerate. Mr. Buckalew retired from the Senate in 1869, but still lives to take a lively interest in political affairs.

George F. Edmunds, of Vermont, was an interesting figure in the Senate during the Reconstruction period. Angular mentally and physically, of deep research and studious habits, a ready and adroit debater, and a keen, critical lawyer, he was dubbed "St. Jerome" by his more intimate friends. Having previously served for some time in the House, he came to the Senate in 1866 already equipped for active participation in its proceedings, and early in his membership took eminent rank in that body. The close intimacy speedily established between Mr. Edmunds and Mr. Thurman—members of radically opposite and wholly irreconcilable political schools—was one of the interesting and unexplainable anomalies of the Senatorial intercourse of the time. It was quite a David-and-Jonathan affair. Sitting on opposite sides of the Chamber, they seemed to have quietly established a signal-code, and it was not uncommon to see them passing out at opposite doors during a lull in the proceedings, and, after a brief absence, spent together in committee-room or at the refectory below, return together with indications that something more than state affairs had been the occasion of their tryst. Luke P. Poland, who, as the successor of Jacob Collamer, was Mr. Edmunds's colleague until 1867, was a unique personality in the Senate as he was later in the House. His strong features, keen eyes, and angular figure,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emphasized by his peculiar dress,—he always wore a blue broadcloth full dress coat, set off with flaring brass buttons,—would have attracted attention in any assemblage.

Roscoe Conkling, of New York, entered the Senate in 1867 at the age of thirty-eight, and at once took first rank as a leader on the Republican side. Though in most respects a stubborn and extreme partisan, Mr. Conkling always awarded to others the same right to their opinions that he claimed for himself. At the close of the Johnson trial a project to expel me from the Senate on the charge of corruptly voting against the impeachment was set on foot by the leaders of the prosecution in the House. Hearing of this, Mr. Conkling came to me and said that if such a proposition reached the Senate, or was likely to do so, I should let him know, and he would "take care of it." That was sufficient. The leaders of the impeachment crusade, with Ben Butler at their head, were moving heaven and earth to find something tangible upon which to base a pretext for my expulsion, but they were soon obliged to abandon their futile efforts. Mr. Conkling possessed many of the elements of true greatness, and, in the consideration of the problems which confronted the country during the Reconstruction period, no man took a weightier or more authoritative part than he; but the quality that most impressed his fellow Senators was his extraordinary will-power. Few men in recent American history have been endowed with greater force of character. In the face of apparently insurmountable obstacles Mr. Conkling bore down all opposition, and this quality was as noticeable in adversity as in success; for, after he had been defeated in his subsequent contest with the Garfield Administration, nothing could induce him to alter his resolve to refrain from all participation in political contests. Mr. Conkling's career was a signal example of what can be accomplished through unalterable purpose and unfaltering zeal.

Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware, took his seat in the Senate two years after Mr. Conkling's entrance, succeeding his father James A. Bayard. The elder Bayard had been chosen by the legislature in 1867 to fill the unexpired term of George Riddle, and the son had been named at the same time for the succeeding full term,—an election without a parallel in the history of this country. The younger Bayard soon won recognition in the Senate as an effective and scholarly debater and an industrious and careful legislator. Under the peculiar conditions at that time prevailing in the Senate, there was little that a Democratic Senator—especially one of recent entry into the body—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could do to identify himself with or to influence legislation, but, ever a safe and sagacious counsellor, Mr. Bayard was able to overcome these conditions, and in later years the dignity and wisdom of American senatorship was illustrated in his career—a career still rich in promise for the future—in a degree far greater than he was honored by it.

John B. Henderson, of Missouri, was another of the bright, ever alert young men of the Senate. Mr. Henderson was one of the seven Republican Senators who deliberately ended their political careers by opposing the impeachment of Mr. Johnson. While he had the seeming advantage in that controversy of representing a State whose people were largely opposed to the conviction of the President, that fact did not save him from the unsparing anathemas of his partisan constituents and associates. Independent and fearless, and actuated by a strong sense of justice and patriotic devotion to his convictions, he voted "not guilty," and at the end of his term cheerfully retired from the Senate, conscious of a duty well and unselfishly performed. Than Carl Schurz, who succeeded Mr. Henderson in 1869, few men have had a more varied career. Mr. Schurz came to the United States in 1848, a political exile from Prussia, whence he had been driven for his part in the revolution of that year. Here he drifted about from one place to another, and from one occupation to another, by turns editor, orator, soldier, and politician, until in 1869 he brought up in the Senate from Missouri. The tendency to shift and change that has characterized him all his life marked his career in the Senate, and rendered it, despite his brilliant intellectual powers, a comparative failure. His subsequent record is familiar to all.

Garrett Davis, then Senator from Kentucky, was a kindly and pleasing reminder of the *ante-bellum* era. Somewhat prolix and overornate in his style of oratory, and wedded to the customs and conditions of his younger days, he sometimes tried the patience of the Senate with his labored essays. He could not adapt himself to the new and to him anomalous and disastrous phases the affairs of the country had taken on, and throughout his term in the Senate these things seemed to him to be in the nature of a personal affliction.

Joseph S. Fowler, of Tennessee, entered the Senate in July, 1866. He had been an active business man before engaging in politics, and during the war an ardent and potential supporter of the Union cause. Manly, modest, and clear-headed, he soon won the kindly regard and respect of his associates, but, as in the case of all Republican Senators

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who failed to support the impeachment of Mr. Johnson, his public career ended with the term he was then serving in the Senate.

Peter G. Van Winkle, of West Virginia, was in some ways a unique figure in the Senate. He was one of the first Senators from the new State of West Virginia—a quiet, grave man externally, but ever ready for a bout of pleasantry with his friends. Though a silent man he always had the courage of his convictions, and he, too, "went to the stake" cheerfully with his six Republican colleagues for refusing to vote for the impeachment. Mr. Van Winkle died at his home in West Virginia soon after the close of the Johnson trial.

William M. Stewart, of Nevada,—returned not long since to the Senate after an absence therefrom of a considerable number of years,—was for two terms covering the Reconstruction period, as he is now, a conspicuous figure in that body. Large of mould both in body and brain, thoroughly equipped in knowledge of the world and its ways, of a genial, generous, but fearless temper, he early took rank in the Senate as a liberal-minded, useful, and capable member. Deeply imbued with practical Western ideas of progress and development, broadly national in all his instincts, and confident of the mighty part that the West is to play in the development of our national industries, and, through that development, also in the politics of the world, Mr. Stewart is likely, before he again leaves the Senate, to exercise a more or less radical influence upon our national industries. Mr. Stewart's colleague during a portion of the Reconstruction period was James W. Nye, a violent partisan, but a man of sterling common sense and homely yet caustic and delightful wit. In earlier life he had been an extremely popular stump orator, and in the Senate he was often able, with a telling anecdote or a laugh-provoking illustration, to demolish at a blow the labored arguments of an opponent. On one occasion a bill to admit the Chinese to equal privileges of citizenship was under discussion in the Senate, and Mr. Sumner had the floor. His speech—as usual elaborate, studied, and classical—was an earnest appeal for the children of the Flowery Kingdom, and at its conclusion it was evident that he had made a deep impression. But, as soon as Mr. Sumner had taken his seat, Mr. Nye sprang to his feet, and spoke somewhat as follows:

"Mr. President: I was born in the grand old county of Steuben, New York State, and raised upon a farm. My parents were hard-working, God-fearing people, and we had morning and evening prayers in which appeals were always offered for the freedom of the slaves. My good mother—green be her memory—was a careful housewife, and among other standard delicacies doughnuts were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always provided. We all loved doughnuts, and I often watched my mother when she made the dough, and kneaded and shortened it until it was in fit condition. The result of my observation was that she always took a small piece of dough and fried it in the fat before she risked the whole batch. She tried it first, and awaited results. I live on the Pacific coast and know a good deal about the Chinese. They have nothing in common with us. They save their money, and then return, pigtail and all, to China. You cannot make a citizen of a man who will not sacrifice his pigtail! We have enfranchised the blacks—they are now free and citizens, and I am content. My friend from Massachusetts has made an able and exhaustive argument, but I suggest to him that it is far better and safer to follow my good mother's example, and fry a little piece of this suffrage dough before we risk the whole Chinese batch."

The effect of this speech was marvellous. Mr. Sumner seldom had a ready appreciation of humor, but on this occasion he leaned back in his chair and laughed until the tears ran down his cheeks. He did not attempt to reply, and the bill failed through the homespun argument adduced by Senator Nye.

Among other notable Senators of the Reconstruction period were Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, counted a sound and safe authority on all questions of revenue and finance; William Windom, of Minnesota, a genial, modest, retiring man, who came to the Senate in 1870, after having served several terms in the House, and left it in 1880 to enter the Cabinet of President Garfield; George H. Williams, of Oregon, an admirable type of the men representing the West in the Senate, of impressive personal appearance, and a forceful though not ready or entertaining speaker; William Sprague, of Rhode Island, whose brilliant early promise had melancholy fruition in later years; and Henry B. Anthony, also of Rhode Island,—but of none do I retain more pleasing recollections than of the Senator last named. Mr. Anthony was a quiet, scholarly man whose voice was seldom heard on the floor, but who exerted great influence in the partisan affairs of the Senate. Moderate in his own views, and always considerate of those of others, he was beloved by his friends and commanded the profound respect of all. Mr. Anthony was elected to the Senate in 1859, and four times re-elected, his period of consecutive service in the body, with the single exception of Thomas H. Benton, being longer than that of any other man in our history.

The House during the Reconstruction period contained not less than a score of men of tried and preëminent ability, but among the Republican leaders the seven gentlemen selected to manage, on behalf of the House, the impeachment of Mr. Johnson before the Senate, claimed for a time the largest share of public attention. Of these,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts, was really the leader and the most conspicuous in the prosecution, and it would be difficult to fittingly characterize the ferocity and unfairness, in determination to convict at all hazards, shown by him from the beginning to the end of the trial. He opened the case with what amounted to a declaration that the fullest latitude in the examination of witnesses should be had, but, immediately upon the beginning of the examination of witnesses for the defence, objected to almost everything offered that would tend to relieve the President of the offences charged. The most abandoned criminal ever before a court of justice was never pursued more relentlessly or viciously than was the President by Mr. Butler. He possessed ability that fell little short of genius, but selfishness, unscrupulousness, malevolence, insolent arrogance, and a consuming egotism marked his career from first to last. Some may accuse me of personal prejudice in this estimate, but I am sure that it will be the sober verdict of history on his life and character.

In the selection, by the House, of the managers of the impeachment, a large number of candidates was nominated, and it was resolved that the seven having the highest vote therefor should be selected. John A. Bingham, of Ohio, received the most votes, and was therefore named as the head of the board. Mr. Bingham had served for many years in the House, and had reached a position of great influence. He was a member of the committee of thirteen on Reconstruction, which, with Thaddeus Stevens at its head, ruled the House with an iron hand, being not inaptly called by the Democratic members the "Central Directory." He was a well-equipped lawyer, and as a fluent and effective debater had no superior in the House.

George S. Boutwell was the second member of the board of managers. He had been governor of his State, and was a scholarly man and a strong debater, but of extreme views and lacking in the liberality and breadth of thought essential to judicious legislation.

James F. Wilson, of Iowa, was the third on the roll, and a conspicuous figure in the House during the Reconstruction period. He at first supported the Ashley impeachment enterprise of 1867, but, discovering that it had no basis, abandoned it, and it was largely due to his personal influence that it was killed in the House. However, in 1868, he espoused the impeachment project of that year and was more or less active in its prosecution down to its defeat in the Senate. Mr. Wilson voluntarily retired from the House in 1869, and thereafter was offered three Cabinet positions, each of which he de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clined, but entered the Senate in 1883 and served in that body until a short time before his death in the present year. He was a profound lawyer, a vigorous speaker, and a man of great force of character.

John A. Logan, of Illinois, was the fourth in order of selection of the board of managers. Though originally an active and influential Democrat, he had been a gallant soldier during the war, and came into the Congress of the Reconstruction era a virulent and aggressive Republican. Bigoted, hot-headed, and imperious, he was sadly lacking in the capacity for leadership, and, especially in the trial of the impeachment, soon found himself at the rear instead of the front. His subsequent career in the House and Senate was in no way a notable one, and his fame will rest mainly on his military achievements.

Thomas F. Williams, of Pennsylvania, was the fifth, and Thaddeus Stevens, of the same State, the seventh, member of the board of managers. The last named, though foremost in the anti-slavery cause in his earlier years, had at the close of the impeachment crusade reached an age and a condition of physical decadence that rendered him ineffective in its active prosecution as well as in the proceedings of the House. He had outlived his usefulness as a legislator.

Prominent among the other Republican members of the House during the Reconstruction period were Samuel Shellabarger and James A. Garfield, of Ohio; William D. Kelley, of Pennsylvania; Charles H. Van Wyck, of New York; Henry L. Dawes, of Massachusetts; Elihu B. Washburn, of Illinois; and James G. Blaine, of Maine. Mr. Shellabarger was one of the most logical and convincing debaters in the House, remarkable for his fairness and unfailing consideration for others. Mr. Garfield was then still under forty, but had already given evidence of the mental activity and the restless ambition which distinguished his career. My personal acquaintance with him was slight, but there was in his face a vein of insincerity repulsive to close students of physiognomy, and which, perhaps, furnished a key to many of the tragic and much-discussed passages in his life. Mr. Kelley, who began his public career as a Democrat and Free-Trader, and ended it a Republican and a radical Protectionist, was an able debater and a stubborn disputant. Mr. Van Wyck served several terms in the House, and then, removing to Nebraska, represented that State for a single term in the Senate. Able, aggressive, often brilliant, and, best of all, clean-handed and honest, his was a striking and unique personality. Mr. Dawes entered the House in 1856 and served therein until 1874, when he succeeded Mr. Sumner in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senate. He remained a member of the latter body until 1892. A kindly, scholarly man, during his long Congressional career he exerted a potent and on the whole beneficial influence on the legislation of the time. Mr. Washburn was the eldest of four brothers representing as many different States in the House during the period of Reconstruction. All were men of shrewdness and unusual capacity for public affairs, but the elder was perhaps the ablest, and his services in the House, during and after the war, were of exceptional value.

Mr. Blaine was then fast forging to the partisan leadership which he secured and held for more than twenty years. No one can deny that he was an extraordinary man, or fail to recognize as almost unparalleled the popularity and influence that fell to his lot. In nearly all respects he was a consummate master of political strategy and tactics, while his magnetic temperament and the charm of his presence gave him a multitude of ardent personal friends and devoted political admirers. Nevertheless, my personal recollections of Mr. Blaine are not of the most pleasant character. During the progress of the impeachment trial he seemed to be disposed to conservatism, but at its close proved relentlessly bitter toward those who had caused its defeat. It had been my duty to present to the President all bills last passed and last acted upon by the Senate. During the pendency of the impeachment all bills coming to me for presentation to the President were, for obvious reasons, retained until the end of the trial. At its close I gathered these together and carried them to the White House. In the street car which I boarded were Mr. Blaine and one or two other members of the House. As I left the car at the Executive Mansion Mr. Blaine remarked to his companions: "There goes the scoundrel to get his pay." We never spoke again. In the second edition of his "Twenty Years of Congress," however, he made partial amends for the remark I have quoted, and one of the gentlemen to whom it was addressed took occasion in after years profoundly and profusely to apologize to me for Mr. Blaine's hasty and ill-bred utterance.

The admitted leaders of the Democratic minority in the House during this period were Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania; James B. Beck, of Kentucky; and Samuel S. Cox, of New York. No man ever deserved better of his country, or served it more honestly and faithfully, than did Mr. Randall. Always a Democrat, he was during the war a bold and consistent advocate of the Union cause,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stoutly sustaining the Government in every measure for the suppression of the rebellion; and in the revolutionary times that followed, his majestic courage and splendid parliamentary skill were always found upholding the highest and broadest ideals of patriotic duty. Resolute, modest, and free from vanity and selfishness, no breath of suspicion was ever blown upon his character. In an era of almost universal corruption he lived and died a poor man. Mr. Beck was a stalwart, broad-shouldered, plain-speaking Scotchman, like Mr. Randall far-sighted and incorruptibly honest, who quickly rose to leadership both in the House and Senate, to which latter body he was promoted in 1876. Mr. Cox, the last of this great Democratic trio, was one of the most lovable and genial men I have ever known. His speeches often abounded with sallies of wit, but there was never malice in his fun, and beneath it all there was ever a broad basis of sterling and saving common sense.

The roll of the Congress of the Reconstruction period is rapidly diminishing, and the men upon whom fell the responsibility of re-establishing the Union are fast passing from earth. More than half the members of the House are dead. There were fifty-four Senators voting at the Johnson trial. Of these thirty-three are dead, and soon, in the course of nature, all will have gone. They passed through and lived in the most stirring and critical chapter in American history. They faced the most threatening, and, in a political sense, most eventful era of their country and their time. They had witnessed, and many of them had been participants in, the greatest contest of arms in modern times. In the hour of the impeachment trial they faced a national danger far more threatening, because more insidious, than was ever the war in its darkest days. The rebellion was carried on in the open, and all could see and realize its force, its danger, and its trend; but on this occasion there was a foe the people did not detect or comprehend. It was hidden from the gaze of the masses intent on the deposition of a President. That danger lay in the exaltation of the legislative branch to supreme control, and the declension of the executive department through the removal of Mr. Johnson on a purely partisan accusation; the destruction of the essential quality of coördination in the several branches of the Government, and the future undisputed rule of a Congressional cabal. Had it not been averted, the end of our federative system would have been inaugurated, and the last days of the great Republic would have begun.

EDMUND G. ROSS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ACTOR, THE MANAGER, AND THE PUBLIC.

An experience of more than fifteen years in the calling of an actor has given me opportunities to note the causes which have led to the present deplorable condition of the stage. A habit of referring things to the operation of an over-swaying intelligence has made me confident that the time is not far off when the good sense of a generous public opinion will demand and effect a revival of pure drama, which will be as complete as any yet accomplished by Americans in art, politics, or social economy. If we have left to the last the establishment of a distinctively good title to a national leadership in the drama, it is chiefly because the past century has claimed from us more attention to political and social preëminence than to the advancement of a general taste in art. It is time, however, that we began to look to the condition and influence of our stage. We have contributed most generously to the support of this institution in the past; we have produced great actors and generously endowed them with fortunes; we have given to the world some excellent examples of dramatic workmanship. It is not very long since we enjoyed the reputation of holding within our confines some of the best actors who spoke the English tongue; but as, in this latter end of the nineteenth century, events follow upon each other rapidly, so, all at once, the stage of the United States has lost its boasted and brilliant ornaments, and with some few shining exceptions the genius which brilliantly illuminated the days of our fathers has refused to enlighten those who aspire to take the places of the departed shadows.

The first notable thing about the stage is that it is made an occasion for poverty. Within the past two years the actors of the United States have been in general and sore need. It is estimated that during the season of 1893–94 more than ten thousand persons, who had for a number of years been earning a living by means of acting, were out of employment and in sore straits. Movements were instituted and carried out in some of the larger cities, by which the public was induced to contribute alms for their relief. Although we hear little to-day about this state of affairs, it is none the less true

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the approaching season of 1895–96 does not bid fair to be an improvement upon those which have immediately preceded it. The number of persons that have been left out of employment may be estimated at fully one-half of those really entitled to call themselves actors. Some of these people, driven by necessity, find refuge in other callings, and strive to earn a living by taking up whatever work may come to hand. Among those who are thus compelled to relinquish the work of the stage, there may be found many men and women who for the past quarter of a century have been entitled to rank as leaders in the dramatic world.

It is related that during this time of stress a member of a dramatic organization protested to the manager, who had proposed a reduction of salaries, that the contemplated reduction would leave him with such a meagre income that it would be impossible for him to provide the ordinary necessities of life. To the manager's answer, "That's none of my business," the actor replied, "But I must live." To this the business-like gentleman responded with the well-worn pseudo-witticism, "Not necessarily."

The actor spoke the truth. He must live, and, more than that, he will live in spite of the will or opinion of managers. Managers, as such, are not necessarily an evil, nor are they always impediments to the proper prosecution of dramatic work. But when the work of the actor begins, the manager becomes merely an attendant upon the business concerns of the theatre. Unlike most other occupations in which men engage, that of the actor affords no possible opportunity for a middle man or representative. I know that it is a matter of frequent remark that actors are not good business men, and that therefore the affairs of the drama must be allowed to remain in the hands of purely commercial-minded persons. This is one of the fallacies so often reiterated that we are wearied into letting it pass in order to be rid of it. So long as the business representative of the drama confines himself to the work of arranging for the performances and taking care of their financial results, all goes well; but unfortunately it is too much their habit to usurp the proper functions of the actor. They strive to do this by proclaiming in advance how good and convincing the play and its performance should be, and, after the performance, sowing broadcast, through the many avenues of public advertisement afforded by the press, the utmost laudation of the play without regard to the manner in which the audience had expressed itself. So it has frequently hap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pened that plays put forward without proper consideration of their merits, and which, when presented, have been coldly received or positively condemned, have been so belauded by theatrical press agencies that other audiences have been deluded into wasting time and money by attending subsequent performances thereof. In numerous instances the wide-extending communities of the United States have been treated to this sort of "confidence game," and the "show business" has been made profitable much upon the same plan that attends many other devices for obtaining an income by representing a worthless commodity as valuable. The cause of this evil lies not in the fault of one only of the three parties concerned, but, like most evils in the world, it lies in a communion of faults or failings. The actor, I know, is apt to blame others for what he fancies to be injury to his calling, and it is equally true that the public is apt to put the blame for the decadence of dramatic art upon the actor. Both at intervals unite in laying upon the shoulders of the manager the entire responsibility for the unhappy condition of affairs. Let us take an unimpassioned look at this really serious matter.

Some years ago there existed in different prominent cities of the United States companies of players known as "stock" actors. This term is now generally tortured, in theatrical advertisements, from its proper meaning. Persons were known as "stock actors" because they were experienced in playing certain parts, and thus, being possessed of a "stock" of such parts, they were engaged as members of the "stock company" in order that any of the standard plays might be presented upon the shortest notice with the least expenditure of trouble. The individual members of a playing company in that time had an opportunity to acquire a knowledge of each other, and of each other's habits of thought and action, which to the actor is of as much importance as the lines and business of his part. They had also the opportunity of becoming acquainted with their public, and their public was afforded a like opportunity of becoming acquainted with them,—elementary considerations of the greatest importance in the performance of a dramatic production. Given a good company, the public to which they appealed for patronage was sure of a good performance. Whether a company was able to present a new play or not was not a matter of concern in those good old days. If there were a new play to be done, so much the better; if not, the old stock company had not lost the power of pleasing. Those were days of slow coaches, of small communities, and long waiting for news and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gossip of the outside world. When the steamship, the electric wire, and the daily newspaper began to draw the ends of the earth more closely together, facility of travel had its effect upon the stock company of actors as well as upon other communities. Actors began to travel from place to place, at first in small circuits, from a natural and commendable desire to increase their usefulness as well as their financial receipts. The theatre-going public encouraged this action from a similarly natural desire to see new faces and witness different renditions of its favorite dramas; and as improvement went on in means of transportation and the dissemination of intelligence, so the fame of particular players became more widespread and afforded an opportunity for the increase of that class of players known as "stars." When the only means of travel from city to city was the public or private coach, actors, from purely economical reasons, hesitated to place themselves before the world in the attitude of stars, no matter how great might be their reputations. But when it became possible to extend a local reputation to half-a-dozen of the principal cities of the country, the actor was not to blame for taking advantage of his opportunity. But the result, so far as the existence of the stock company was concerned, was that no sooner had a particular actor gained a considerable reputation than he began to look for means to place himself in the rank of stars, and by these defections the managers of stock companies found themselves every year more and more impeded in their purpose of keeping up a high standard of artistic work.

It was at this time, and in consequence of this state of affairs, that the speculating manager came into existence. The standard theatres of our country had been under the direction of men identified with dramatic art either as actors or as persons who had engaged in the occupation of manager out of a laudable and exemplary disposition to encourage and uphold the drama as an art. Many of them found their way into the government of a theatre from other artistic occupations, and as a class they were conservative. However, when our actors began to seek opportunities to shine before the world in individual capacities, they naturally sought the assistance of active-minded and energetic individuals who would devote themselves to the task of preparing the way, and of making smooth the financial or business difficulties which might attend progress in the new orbit. The gentlemen of this class, first employed as salaried servants, ultimately became partners individually entitled to a greater or less percentage of the earnings of their star, and the humble designation of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"agent" was exchanged for the title of "manager." In the early periods of the change it was only the star and his agent who travelled from city to city, and in each place they found resident companies qualified to give support in all well-known plays; but in the course of time some of the principal stars became dissatisfied with the support which they received, and ventured upon the experiment of engaging and carrying with them other actors upon whom they could rely for the performance of the important characters in their plays. The only places left for the stock company to fill were the minor and unimportant ones. This example was followed by other and less influential stars, and so another element of dissatisfaction grew up among the actors who were left to support the dignity of the stock companies. Wider and wider grew the general desire to obtain admission to the now considerably extended group of stars. The old conservative managers found themselves deserted, year after year, by their actors, and the difficulty of replacing them with thoroughly reliable people was demonstrated by many unfortunate experiments and the growing dissatisfaction of hitherto faithful patrons.

One day a daring innovator concluded to try the experiment of organizing and taking about the country an entire company of players to present a particular play. The public, which had now become weary of the depreciated performances of the stock companies, eagerly welcomed this new and, to it, delightful departure. The "combination system," as this new method of organization came to be called, was a great success and met with instantaneous and substantial encouragement. Theatres which had been hitherto occupied by stock companies were opened to the combinations. The resident company, if there were one, was sent away for the time being, in order to make room for the newer organization. The manager of the theatre recognized that his best advantage from a business point of view lay in dispensing entirely with a stock organization as soon as he found that he could place combinations successively upon his stage and keep his theatre occupied for the regular season. One after another all the theatres thus became combination houses. The old order remained in vogue only in three or four instances in metropolitan cities.

Next came the most distinctively dangerous novelty which afflicted the life of the drama. The stock of plays known as the "standard drama" did not afford sufficient material for the growing influence of the combination. It was well enough for actors who had made a reputation in particular parts or in particular plays, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the new aspirant found it easier to rise to fame and fortune in the wake of a new play. So for a number of years it has been the fashion for every aspiring actor to seek some novel dramatic idea upon whose reputation he might easily ascend to the stellar spaces. "The play's the thing!"—became the rallying cry of the dramatic enthusiasts. All kinds of plays were produced with varying degrees of success. The French, German, Italian, and Spanish fields lay invitingly open for translation and adaptation, and were industriously harvested. The hosts of playwrights, numerous at all times, were inordinately increased by the innovation. Time was when it seemed important that a writer, in order to qualify himself for dramatic invention, should have some practical knowledge of stage work. It might once have been supposed that actors such as Shakespeare, Molière, Garrick, Cibber, Macklin, and Sheridan Knowles were more likely than other men to produce the best inventions for play-making, but such notions could be regarded only as the prejudices of non-progressive minds. It seemed for some time as if the world were full of plays. Everybody was making one or more. It once afforded me much edification to note the pleasure with which a very worthy and esteemed friend, who occupied the position of dramatic critic on an influential daily paper, informed me that one of his plays had been accepted and paid for by a prominent manager whose company was then playing in the city. My good friend would have most indignantly resented any imputation that his view of the acting of the company about which he wrote a column every day could be affected by so vile a means as the offer of indirect bribery,—but the play which he sold to the manager was never produced.

As the number of attempts at dramatic work increased, it became more difficult to determine the good from the bad. The manager and the actor ultimately shifted the responsibility for this judgment to the public, which has now for a long period patiently borne the odium for much nonsense that goes by the name of "play." Startling and fascinating announcements, fashioned with the utmost art of the lithographer and printer, are relied upon to strengthen or supplant any lukewarm or indifferent verdict given by the public jury. And so the hurly-burly has gone on until sensible people have grown very weary of the impertinent and constantly repeated efforts to make them responsible upholders of the "show business." A vast and disproportionate army of theatrical managers—men whose darling desire it is to see their names in two-by-four letters, and their faces in five

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

colors, on the advertising boards—has sprung up by the opportunity thus afforded for the exercise of the art of getting something for nothing. By imperceptible degrees the position of the actor has been entirely changed. Once he was a person who possessed a certain power and was entitled to a certain consideration. He knew how to act and what was necessary toward the making of a good play. His opinion was deferred to and his judgment sought. The commercial prosperity of the old-time "agent" has, however, made that member arrogant in these regards, and he now no longer defers to the experience of the man who plays. The latter must conform his conduct to the direction of the box-office man, and much and great is the dissatisfaction resulting from this reversal of functions. Not the least important of the dissatisfied parties is the public. It sees, without knowing why, that there is something wrong with both actor and play, and it naturally blames the actor. He is the one responsible to it. No agent can represent the actor in his work. If the actor is blameworthy for helping to break down the rational organization of the theatre, the manager is equally so for thrusting himself into the actor's place and presuming to dictate how and what plays shall be performed. Does it not always happen that the pleasing power of any given play or set of plays is referred solely to the actors, and do they not eventually become the actual controllers of the theatre, no matter how assiduously the agent of their work tries to keep his name in print as the head of "my theatre" or of "my company"?

But has the public borne no share in the disintegration of safe and healthy tissue in the body of dramatic taste? Were it not for the encouragement to that end, found in the disposition of men to desert old friends for the excitement of seeing strange faces and hearing unfamiliar voices, the social preëminence of tried and reliable stock companies could never have been affected by disturbing notions of change. The faces were not always pleasant to look upon, and the voices sometimes caused a longing for more familiar methods of speech; but the reflection that we had seen and heard the actors of strange countries imbued us with new pride and a feverish desire to have more, but better, of the same kind. Meantime the world, acted upon by the new magic of mechanical ingenuity, keeps growing smaller, and we realize that strange countries and strange players are not better than our own. So we sigh for the good things of the past from which we turned in fancied satiety. Yes, theatre-goers must bear a share of the blame, as gracefully as may be, for it has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rested and still rests with them to keep safe the excellence of our dramatic art. Else why have they the privilege of freely expressing approval or dislike, and are safeguarded from disturbance in the salutary expression of the hiss? No actor, director, or policeman dares assert his judgment against the sovereign power of a well-timed hissing. The good-breeding of Americans seldom permits them to resort to this effectual method of correcting the evils of the theatre; they prefer to stay away from the occasion of offence. A vigorous and healthy public opinion, which sturdily insists upon its prerogative, and in the theatre utters its word of law, is greatly to be commended. The gentle spirit of toleration (or is it the despicable feeling which is described by that perversion of truth, "everybody's business is nobody's business") has made room and license for the unscrupulous and depraved to flaunt their brazen immoralities in the very places made sacred by the memory of Edwin Booth and his compeers.

Even that honorable and potent organ of the public mind, the press, is in this regard not blameless. An occasional editorial appears, in which the lamentable condition of the public theatre is deplored, but the columns set apart for notices of the drama continue to be stuffed out with the sawdust of box-office literature. So long as the managerial promoter of inane or erotic suggestions is permitted to furnish for publication in daily and influential journals his own estimate of the monstrosities of impudence and vice with which he degrades the stage, reform in the theatre can have little encouragement. Let some able and clear-minded editor set a good and sorely needed example by requiring that copy furnished by that gad-fly of journalism, the theatrical manager's press agent, shall be marked in his columns like other advertisements. Then his strong editorials upon the decay of dramatic taste will have excellent emphasis.

The United States is a broad and busy country, and it is well supplied with excellent journals. As is natural and unavoidable, these generally take their tone in treating dramatic affairs from those of the metropolis. What is said and done in New York about plays and actors is published all over the Union as quickly as the wire and the press can spread the news. Consequently the theatrical business of the entire country is managed from New York. That is why actors, managers, and the minor personages of stage life flock to New York. That is why for many years past it has been possible for the wily speculator in rotten dramatic lumber to set up a flimsy stage struc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ture, held together only by the adhesive qualities of paint and printer's ink, and—by keeping a New York theatre open and empty for its exhibition for a stated term of weeks at the expense of three or four thousand dollars a week, and by a continual pestering of the good-natured journalist—to obtain a sufficient amount of notice of his "great New York success!" to enable him to travel through the country with his "show," and gather a rich harvest from those who are eager to see what sort of plays please the people of the great city. Of course the "show" soon falls to pieces from the weight of its own worthlessness, and the seeds of general contempt for New York's good taste in theatrical matters are sown broadcast. But no matter. The enterprising speculator, now well in funds, returns to New York and is soon upon the full tide of another like venture. Year after year this sort of thing goes on. But the people of the East, South, and West are becoming wise and weary. The "business" is not so good now as it once was in those often-deluded sections. One of the roots of our theatrical troubles upon which the axe should fall quickly and sharply is this abuse of the press courtesy,—first extended in good nature toward the struggling artist, but now demanded as a right by the brass-bound "show-boomer."

It would weary a very patient reader were I to enumerate one-half of the most flagrant evils which have fallen upon the path of the actor as a logical consequence of the failure of the old resident and regular companies. I may be pardoned for briefly noting one which bears a direct relation to the pauperizing effect of the present perversion of the drama. So successfully was the duping of the "jay" public outside New York carried on, that it began to be believed that the same result could be effected without the employment of experienced actors. So eagerly did the general public crowd to see the new play, that the conclusion forced itself upon the active-minded money-maker who controlled its performance that it was no longer necessary to keep an expensive company of players. There was a time when good players could not be procured except at a considerable expense. Now the places once filled with men and women who had spent the best years of their lives in the study and practice of their calling are often given to tyros who know no more of acting than can be gathered from the ill-tempered directions of a so-called stage-manager, who for a few weeks directs confused and incomprehensible rehearsals of the so-called "play." The importation of these inexperienced people into the dramatic calling, for which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

privilege the deluded wretches are often induced to pay extravagantly instead of standing in receipt of salary, gives us more poor actors,—for they delight to call themselves such, although, after a year or two of unprofitable association with some never-again-to-be-heard-of combination, they find themselves replaced by new-fledged learners.

The actor is the one most to be commiserated in the disgraceful result which has attended his abandonment of the true dignity of his calling. If he be a star, and has made money, he enjoys neither his notoriety nor his fame, for he has become a "part." Having made a reputation and a fortune through the performance of a certain character, his future career is tied to the mask of that character. He is remembered for it, reminded of it, compared to it, no matter where he goes, what he does, or how often he tries to destroy the memory of it by trying to assume a new and different part. As a stock actor he was praised for his ability effectively to assume a number of different and dissimilar parts. Why can he not be so now? Ah! that was when he came before a contented company of good friends, who were gratified to see him every night for months. He had a home. He enjoyed domestic happiness. He was even an active and interested citizen. It is not so now. He must go before a new public every week. At most he can stay only a few weeks at a time, and then only when he has a new play. He lives in hotels and railroad trains; he is separated from his family; he is disfranchised and outlawed.

If the actor be a mere wandering asteroid, an inconsiderable speck from the broken planet of a once regularly moving theatre, and working for a salary, woe worth him! Added to the inevitable discomforts of constant travel, he is ever haunted by the fear that he may not get an engagement for next season. A few years ago he might have enjoyed content when this desired result was effected, but now he is still further steeped in the hell of uncertainty by the fact that all except the indispensable first lady and gentleman of a company are obliged to agree that their contracts may be cancelled by either party thereto upon the serving in writing of a two weeks' notice. If an actor is perchance engaged, upon some sudden emergency, without this formality, as by telegram or hurried verbal agreement, let him not be sure of his position. He may be summarily replaced two thousand miles from home, and left among strangers with the jeering remark that he may seek his remedy at law. I have been treated to that experience in the course of my practical study of the drama. It is not pleasant, and it is very expensive.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Those who have taken from the actor the right to control the destinies of the theatre will find the task too great for their little wits. Their point of view is too small. They see and hear the public only through the archway of their box-office window, while the actor steps out face to face and voice to voice with his public, beneath the broad sweep of the proscenium. Managers boast of their great astuteness. To what a condition have they brought the American stage! They have striven for and worn the honors of leadership, yet they cannot shelter themselves from the odium of the result by throwing the whole burden of blame upon a long-suffering and patient public with the hackneyed absurdity—"We gave the public what it wanted." Their case is being considered in the jury-room of good citizens, and there will be no appeal from the verdict when once it is rendered. It is the privilege of the American people to have a clean stage, and some day they will sweep the rubbish from it. The wonder then will be, as it is now with regard to certain other reformed abuses: "How could this shame have been allowed to live so long?" The seeds of corruption grow very fast. Every succeeding theatrical season develops a new weakness in the decaying edifice which shelters the usurping pretenders of the drama. At any moment it may come down "by the run."

The reëstablishment of the stock company will be the natural and only remedy for these evils. The employment of skilled actors qualified to make plays, and their fixed establishment under the direction of an actor-manager, is the only means by which a good theatre can be assured. Such a company, fully qualified to play any of the standard plays before the most exacting audience, could be organized for every city in the Union from the unemployed but experienced and able actors who are vainly seeking work to-day. With them the new play would be perfectly safe. In spite of the oft-repeated taunt that "the actor is the worst judge of a play," my observation has been that wherever the judgment of a cool-headed actor (and from such I must set apart the one who nurses a starring-bee in his bonnet) is invoked, he seldom fails to justify absolute confidence in his ability to determine what should be, from what should not be, in a play.

Once let us get to the understanding that all actors cannot be stars, and the way toward the restoration of the drama will begin to clear. I think I can see promise of this result in the future. There is no great glory in being a star of the limited magnitude to which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the one-play actor soon shrinks. The effort to reach that doubtful honor grows more futile every year. By the time an opportunity is made for the setting up of a safe and reliable stock company, good actors will be satisfied to remain in association with a just manager of their own order, and work earnestly for the production of good plays. The public will turn with delight to the refreshing influence of the honest, world-old, heart-touching play, wherein virtue is applauded and vice condemned in good set terms. The manager will, I am sure, be glad to get back to his natural position of actor's assistant, and to be rid of the rashly assumed and ill-carried responsibility which has so disturbed his rest and health and whitened his few remaining hairs.

All sorts of suggestions have been made for the amelioration of the drama in this country. One unconsciously turns to the system of France and Germany, and dreams of a subsidized guild. Nothing of the sort could ever be set up in the United States. A system of social subvention—the formation of a fund by subscription—has frequently been tried in England. In fact, since the decay of the vogue whereby actors prospered as members of the royal or noble households of the realm, such assurances have been generally relied upon. But while that may be done in a small island where the metropolis of London is practically the country, it becomes impossible in a great country like the United States, unless the organization be of sufficient importance and power to provide for the entire country. Such an organization is not unlikely. When one thinks of the great fortunes that have been made out of the calling of the actor in this country, and of the wide field for effort in the right direction from which sure and immediate profit would result, it seems strange that no business movement has yet found out the possibilities of the actor as an investment.

JOHN MALONE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HIGHER PAY AND A BETTER TRAINING FOR TEACHERS.

It is conceded in America, but in a very general way, that one of the first duties of parents and citizens is to provide for the proper education of the growing children. I say that this concession is made only in a very general way, because neither as parents nor as citizens do the men and women of America display any really great concern as to the education of their children. In sentimental fashion they will glow over the benefits of education, and the Fourth of July orator can always be sure of applause when he declares that that land will always be free from whose every hilltop may be seen a school-house and a church,—twin sentinels of intelligence and piety. But this interest is only superficial except in a few favored localities where education has been esteemed at its true worth. In such neighborhoods the schoolmaster was a personage of consideration, who ranked with the clergyman in the social scale and was not far below the judge and the Congressman. But such localities are few and far between, and the rule now is that even in college towns the professors are not looked up to as anything in the least remarkable. And as for ordinary school-teachers—they are looked down upon by nearly all classes, old and young, and generally thought to be unfortunates who have adopted teaching because there was no other way of livelihood open to them. It is wrong, to be sure, that school-teachers should be held in such social and industrial disesteem; but at present it is not entirely unfair to the great body of teachers of primary and grammar schools in the United States, for, generally speaking, neither their attainments nor their ideals entitle them to a much higher regard. Without training or preparation, without taste, and without love for what should be the highest and most sacred calling for men and for women, they have adopted the profession of teaching and have degraded it to a trade upon which both tradesmen and artisans look down.

But we should not visit our condemnation on the poor teachers alone. They have become what they are in obedience to the immu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

table natural law of supply and demand. There was a demand for teachers and there was no supply of properly trained teachers, so the incompetents secured the places. The fault for this lay with the citizens, the taxpayers and their representatives, who have failed to see that no one except a specially trained man or woman should ever be put in charge of a class-room. These citizens, these school commissioners, these school trustees, have not seen that there was a necessity for a higher type of teachers; and so long as petty politicians are permitted to monopolize these offices there is little likelihood that these officials will see anything more than their own inflated importance and the opportunities to "put up jobs," with the aid of the publishers of school-books, so as to defraud the public treasury.

Speaking to a school trustee a few years ago I advanced the opinion that the public schools in the United States were in a very unsatisfactory condition, mainly because the teachers were incompetent, or, if competent, because there were not enough of them employed. He expressed great astonishment and some indignation. He had never met, he said, finer men and women than the school-teachers in his ward. They were educated ladies and gentlemen. From his standpoint all this was so. But teachers should not be looked at from his standpoint. He was an entirely uneducated man, who had made a little fortune by keeping a livery-stable. His own success made him feel in his heart that learning was somewhat debilitating in its effect on manliness, and he was proud to tell that he had passed only a few months at school. Now this man in his own ward, in which there was a great school with primary and grammar departments, selected the teachers, passed upon their fitness, and naturally enough looked upon them as most excellent instructors of the young, for there was not one among them who was not vastly superior to him in learning and accomplishments. He explained to me how admirably his system of selecting teachers worked. "There was old Brown," he said, "who kept the saloon two corners below. The old man had a heap of trouble, and when he died two years and a half ago with the rheumatiz, his place was sold out by the sheriff. But his daughter Susie was a mighty likely girl, and had been eddicated right thar in my school. So I ups and has her 'pointed first-class assistant. Old Brown had stuck by me in all the elections, and I bet you I warn't goin' to let his family suffer, long as I had a place I could give one on 'em. So I ups and gets this place for Susie, and she done fust rate. I give her the promotion, end of this session, and next

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year she goes in as principal. Now that's what I call good politics and good reform. Keep the best places for your own friends, and save the promotions for your neighbors in your own ward."

I was so much touched by this moving tale that I asked to be introduced to this brilliant teacher. The trustee was only too happy. We went at once to the school. Miss Susie was a young woman of twenty-five or so, with bleached yellow hair and rouged cheeks, and the airs of a fine lady in a stage melodrama. Her accent was atrocious, her voice shrill and sharp. Her manner was devoid of simplicity, but evidently impressed the school trustee as of high quality. To his compliments on her appearance and her management of her class she smiled graciously, but made no pretence of disclaiming every merit in sight. While the teacher's attention was thus taken away from her class there was a little disturbance in one corner of the room. Miss Susie whacked her desk with a ruler and called sharply: "Here, Mattie Simmons, what do you mean by such deportment?"

"I didn't do nothing, ma'am," replied the girl addressed.

"Didn't do nothing!" called Miss Susie. "Where do you expect to go to? I seen you when you done it. We will discuss your deportment when these gentlemen go."

The gentlemen went very shortly afterward, and I never learned how Mattie Simmons came out of the difficulty. But the school trustee was delighted. "She don't stand no nonsense, do she?" he asked.

It is quite likely that in the city alluded to, a prosperous place of the third rank in point of wealth and population, there were not many schools managed so badly as this one under the special charge of the livery-stable keeper; but the rest could not have been a very great deal better, for the reason that the other members of the school board were almost as ignorant as this man. I attended one of the meetings of the board. The men appeared to be very nearly of the same class as New York aldermen, except that they were not so smart in appearance, diamond shirt-pins and silk hats not being so essential to the dress of the politicians of the smaller places as they are to the people's representatives in the great cities. When a member spoke, he usually used the language of the streets and showed no regard for the rules of grammar. Each man spoke of the patronage to which he was entitled with entire frankness, and it was quite evident that the schools in this city were conducted by the board merely to supply places in which men and women chosen by the trustees could draw salaries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be said that it is not fair to generalize from one or two incidents. It is not; but Dr. Rice's investigations, the results of which were printed several years ago in THE FORUM, show that in many of the cities, including the great city of New York, there were teachers just as ignorant as Miss Susie Brown.

The great cause which hinders public education in this country is the fact that the people, the citizens, the voters, have no genuine love for education and no real appreciation of what learning is. If their interest and their appreciation amounted to anything, they would see to it that the school trustees and school commissioners were themselves persons of education and cultivation. And any school that is conducted by teachers who are uneducated and untrained in the art of teaching is likely to do as much harm as good. By laws we protect litigants from falling into the hands of pettifoggers who have not been admitted and licensed to practise at the bar after a regular course of instruction. So, too, we protect sick people from the ignorance of physicians not regularly graduated from a school of medicine. But our teachers, though after a perfunctory examination they acquire a certificate to teach, in six cases out of ten are young women with no heart in their work, and who intend to follow the trade only until they are invited to marry; in two other cases they are young men who wish to support themselves while studying what they consider a real profession; in another the teacher is an incompetent; while in the remaining case of the stated ten the teacher is likely to be a serious person seriously pursuing a life-work because he or she is interested in the work and conscious of its high nobility. Here we have four classes of teachers where there should be only one. And until there is only one the public schools in the United States will continue to be what they are to-day,—a reproach to our boasted civilization, a refutation of our much-vaunted pride in free education.

It were idle to speak of these things unless at the same time a remedy were suggested. Already it has been affirmed with unhesitating positiveness that nothing can be done for the betterment of our public schools until educated men are put in control of the school boards. Without such a reform and unless teaching is made an honorable profession, in which distinction might be gained, and an easy competence be acquired, we can never expect that it will attract the same class of persons as those now drawn to the law, to medicine, to engineering, to the pulpit, and to business. In these pursuits great rewards are to be gained, great prizes won,—wealth,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fame, and social position. But by teaching, under present conditions, poverty is the portion of even the most successful. And as for the other things that men think are worth striving for, they are out of reach from the beginning.

Let us look at what can be earned by teachers in some of the cities, and compare these sums with what men in other professions and occupations are paid, for then we shall be able to see that an ambitious man or woman would be repelled by the prospect that opens before a teacher, and be attracted by the outlook in other pursuits. In New York the largest salary of a principal of a "male or mixed grammar school" is $3,000; while to principals of "female grammar schools" the highest salary is $1,700. The highest sum paid to a principal of a primary school (average attendance of 1,001 pupils and upward) is $1,700. The teachers of grammar schools are paid from $573 to $1,116 a year; the teachers of primary schools from $504 to $900. Thus, in a city where living is dearer than in any other place in the world, the compensation ranges from $504 to $3,000. It makes no difference how able, how cultivated, how astute, how skilful a politician a teacher may be, he has reached the limit when he has come to $3,000. Now suppose such a man had gone into the law, or into medicine, or into the pulpit, or into business. The same kind of success which brings the teacher $3,000 would bring the lawyer anywhere from $10,000 to $100,000 a year, and it would also bring him and his family social consideration. A similar reward would come to the successful physician. No pulpit in New York is considered to be worth having unless the salary is $5,000 including a parsonage, while some clergymen make great fortunes from salaries and gifts. The business man is not considered to have begun to succeed until his income is more than $10,000. But the teacher in New York has earned all he can ever earn when the $3,000 mark has been reached, and even this may be cut down if for any year there are fewer than a certain number of pupils in his school.

The salaries paid in New York are a very fair average of the salaries received by teachers in other Eastern cities. The amounts are slightly higher in New York but in other places the cost of living is so much less that the salaries are actually better than in the metropolis. But it may be depended on that a $3,000 man in New York is a cheap man even though he has reached the top of his profession. The average of compensation for teachers is below $1,000 a year, so that in compensation a New York school-teacher is not put on a par

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a good bookkeeper, a stenographer with a knowledge of spelling and grammar, or with a skilful cook. This, to be sure, is compensation enough for the young ladies who would work a little till they have a chance to wed; it is quite enough for the young men who are learning other professions and "teaching" *ad interim;* it is more than enough for the unfortunates and incompetents for whom no other means of livelihood are open; but it is not enough for accomplished and refined men and women who devote themselves to one of the noblest of all callings, and there should be none others as teachers in the public schools. The men and women who adopt this calling should be made to feel that a great career is open to them, and that in success they will achieve the same measure of fame that comes to the successful in other walks of life. When this has been done it is possible that ambitious young men and women will matriculate in schools of pedagogy as they do at present in schools of law, of medicine, and of theology. There would be plenty of room in the profession of teaching, and plenty of opportunity to rise, for in 1890 there were 341,811 teachers in the public schools of the United States,—96,581 men and 245,230 women.

The following facts as to salaries paid to teachers in various parts of the country for the year 1889–90 (the last year for which a full report is available) will give an idea of what teachers in the cities receive for their work. In Worcester, Mass., the highest salary paid to a male principal in an elementary school was $2,000. The highest salary paid to a woman principal was $1,400. In that city the lowest salary paid to an assistant was $450, while 124 assistants received $500. In Detroit, Mich., the highest salary to a principal was $2,000, the lowest to an assistant was $350. Provision is however made in Detroit for an assistant to receive greater pay as the teacher acquires more experience, so that after nine years of service the assistant may receive $725. In Minneapolis, Minn., a principal of an elementary school with a grammar grade may, after six years of service (presumably in that position), receive $1,300, the salary for the first year having been $900,—this for a twelve-room building. In Omaha, Neb., a principal after five years' experience may receive $1,400; other teachers in Omaha receive for the first year $400, there being an annual increase of $50 a year till a maximum of $700 be reached. In Jersey City, N. J., a man when principal of a grammar school receives $1,950, a woman $1,020. The assistants begin at $360 and their salaries are increased to a maximum of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$624. In Syracuse, N. Y., salaries in elementary schools range from $1,600 for a principal (man) to $300 for an assistant (woman). In Portland, Ore., the principal of a grammar school with five years of service receives $1,800; a novice in the grammar schools there receives $600 for the first year and may rise in five years so as, while still an assistant, to receive $750. In Springfield, Ohio, a principal in an elementary school may receive $1,100; the lowest salary paid in that city is $150 for a female assistant in the elementary school; the average for female assistants there, however, appears to be about $400 a year. In Providence, R. I., the principal of a grammar school may receive $1,900, while the lowest paid to an assistant in a grammar school is $575. In Richmond, Va., a principal of a grammar school receives $1,350; a teacher of the third grammar grade receives $450, while a teacher of the lowest primary grade receives $405. In Dallas, Texas, a principal of an elementary school receives $1,125; an assistant (female) receives $540. The teacher of mathematics in the High School at Charleston, S. C., receives $675; the professor of *belles lettres* is paid $525, while the teacher of elocution gets $400. In Memphis, Tenn., a principal of an elementary school receives for his first year of service $720. After the fourth year his salary is $1,000. Assistants begin on $360, and after the fourth year receive $540. And so on throughout the country.

In the country, whether in the East or West, North or South, the compensation to school-teachers is so small that it seems wonderful that those who receive these salaries can live on them. These salaries range from $100 a year to $900 a year. The average for a school year of about seven months is $318.36 for men and $262.92 for women. The duties of a country school-teacher usually include cleaning the school-house and building the fires. These duties are not always considered to be hardships by the persons who take such posts, as the women in all save exceptional cases have been accustomed to such work at home, and the men find it easy enough to get pupils to do the work in exchange for favors in school. In the country schools of the United States there are three times as many women as men, the percentage being a little greater than in the cities. Most country schools have only one teacher, and that teacher is required to instruct children of all ages and in all branches up to grammar and algebra. The amount of either grammar or algebra dispensed in these schools is quite inconsiderable, as these are branches of knowledge not in demand. For what these country

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teachers do, as the schools are at present established, it is likely that they are quite adequately paid. A village schoolmaster will earn as much as the cobbler; the schoolmistress will make as much in the year as the dressmaker. They do not belong, as a general thing, to a class better educated than the cobbler or dressmaker, and they do not work any harder. Those of them who have thought about their calling, and who have ever been moved to feel that great responsibilities devolved upon them, have realized that the conditions were such that they could do next to nothing, and usually they have given over any efforts to secure a change in school administration. For instance, here is a case that came directly under my observation. In a village school there were two rooms, one on the ground floor and one upstairs. The upstairs room had never been finished and plastered, though the school-house was of brick and had been built seventy-five years. The schoolmaster was a man of fifty, who had lost a leg at Gettysburg and received a pension from the Government. He had been a teacher in a small city for twenty years and came to the village in search of health. He was a manly fellow and cultivated quite beyond the average of country schoolmasters. He was asked to take the village school at $600. He accepted without knowing what he was doing. When the school assembled in September he found that he had eighty-nine pupils, ranging from nineteen years of age to toddlers of six. He was expected to teach this congregation of ingenuous youth all that each needed to know, the branches ranging from the alphabet to surveying and grammar. After two weeks, in which he did nothing more than look over the field, he got the school committee together and requested that he have another teacher, and that the upstairs room be finished so that two classes could be heard at once. The school committee asked for his immediate resignation, because they were persuaded that his request showed laziness and incompetence. In the same township there is a teacher of twenty-five years' experience. He is generally considered a good teacher, and as a citizen commands the respect of his neighbors. For the last school year he taught for nine and a half months at $50 a month. There appeared to be some hesitation on the part of the school committee about re-engaging him, so he offered to take the school for the next session at $40 a month and to furnish also the necessary fuel. The committee, while acknowledging that he had had for years the best school in the township, declined his proposition because he was a Republican in politics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The average pupil of the average country school does not even learn to write with ease or plainness. In arithmetic such pupils acquire enough to solve the simple sums in addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division which they meet with in practical life. This inefficiency of the country school has resulted in what might quite properly be called "the American peasantry" being as illiterate and unlearned as any class of people in any civilized state in the world. They can read and they can write. But they do not understand what they read, and, never having been taught how to think, they are the easy victims of every bustling demagogue who promises to give them something for nothing. The American farmer of two generations ago was a better educated man than is the American farmer of to-day. No one would ever have thought of calling him a peasant; he did not suggest such a thing in his manner of life, poor though it was; nor yet in his manner of thinking, though that may have been narrow. Let any candid observer go into a neighborhood where the land has been tilled by the same family for generations, and let him find a farm where there are still three generations upon it. He is almost sure to find that those of the oldest generation can speak, write, and think with more accuracy than the second generation, and that the second generation will show more evidences of education than the third. This shows degeneration, and this degeneration can be directly traced to the decadence of the country public schools, which now are really beneath discussion, were there not a hope that by telling of their badness some interest might be excited, and that through this interest they might be improved. We do not want an ignorant peasantry in this country—we have no use for peasants. But we are getting such a class, both by importation and by breeding. The city schools are bad enough in all conscience; the principle which controls their government is both false and corrupt; but they are fountains of light compared with the country schools that prevail in the United States to-day. In a country school, as at present governed, the more a teacher knows, the less is his or her ability to accomplish anything; so those who are wise and politic do as little as possible, hoping thereby to escape the hostile judgment of ignorant school committeemen. In a country district the clergymen, the physicians, and the lawyers should be asked to serve on the school committee, for men of these professions presumably have some education. But the noisy and disputatious village busybodies are usually those chosen. There is no use in refusing to look facts squarely in the face; and the fact

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that country people—agricultural people—are growing more ignorant generation by generation is so patent that instances need not be recited to prove it. The mere spending of more money on country schools will not effect any reform. The States, for a while at least, must take the schools in rural districts under control.

The school-teachers in other lands than this occupy positions in marked contrast to those held by their colleagues in the United States. They do not receive marvellously liberal salaries, but where living is cheaper than it is here the same amount of money goes much farther than with us. Their social position, however, in England, France, and Germany is infinitely superior to that of American teachers. Mr. Gladstone in England did not hesitate to marry his daughter to the master of a school. Why should he? The master of a public school in England is as good a gentleman, if he happen to be a gentleman, as the next man, let him be who he may. His occupation is nothing against him. Here it is. To be a teacher is presumptive evidence of lack of force, of deficiency of mental initiative. School-teachers should be considered the elect of the land, and they will be so considered when they are selected from that class which is the best in every community. The school-teacher should be a leader in the social life and an adviser in the political life of every neighborhood, because the position is the most important public local office held in any community. To him or to her we depute the payment of the largest share of our debt to our offspring and to posterity. The teachers, therefore, should be men and women of better training and more liberal cultivation, and in order to get such teachers we should, through educated school trustees and school commissioners, offer higher salaries and a more secure tenure of office. Then, when our children go to school to educated ladies and gentlemen, to men and women trained in the art and science of teaching, we will accord to those teachers the position they should always have held,—the position of honorable precedence over all the trades and an equality with the other learned professions.

JNO. GILMER SPEED.

NOTE.—In 1886 the average salary of teachers in Prussia was $267.56; in New York State, including the cities, $409.27. In Prussia, however, the teacher received dwelling, fuel, and light free. Teachers in Prussia are pensioned by the state. In France, in 1889, male and female teachers, not holding certificates of capacity for professorship, received salaries respectively of $400 and $360. They also received lodgings, or an allowance for lodgings.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED